DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 333 776 HE 024 603

TITLE	Condition of America's Schools and Colleges. Hearing Examining Whether the Nation Is Meeting Its Education Goals and To Review Proposals To Reauthorize the Higher Education Act, Focusing on Problems and Reforms in Elementary and Secondary Education, Strengths and Weaknesses of Higher Education, and Access to Student Federal Aid Programs, before the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, United States Senate, One Hundred Second Congress, First Session.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources.
REPORT NO	Senate-Hrg-102-28
PUB DATE	9 Jan 91
NOTE	101p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Colleges; *Educational Assessment; *Educational Change; *Educational Planning; Educational Policy; *Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; Hearings; Higher Education; *Needs Assessment; School Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS	Congress 102nd; Higher Education Act 1980; Reauthorization Legislation

ABSTRACT

This report provides a transcription of the speeches and written statements presented at a Senate hearing concerning the state of crisis within American education. The hearing examines whether the nation is meeting its education goals and reviews proposals to reauthorize the Higher Education Act. It focuses on problems and reforms in elementary and secondary education, the strengths and weaknesses of higher education, and student access to federal aid programs. Testimony is provided by the following individuals: Hameen Diggins, an 8th grader at Shoemaker Middle School, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Anikee Ajagunna, Senior, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey; Claiborne Pell, U.S. Senator from the State of Rhode Island; Roy Romer, Governor of the State of Colorado; Constance Clayton, Superintendent, Philadelphia Public Schools, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Floretta McKenzie, President, the McKenzie Group, District of Columbia; Michael Timpane, President, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York; James L. Bush, sponsor of the "I Have a Dream" program at the Mather School, Dorchester, Massachusetts; Chester E. Finn, Professor of Education at Vanderbilt and Director, Educational Excellence Network, District of Columbia; and Robert L. Albright, President, Johnson C. Smith University, Charlotte, North Carolina. (GLR)

S. HRG. 102-28

CONDITION OF AMERICA'S SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

ED333778

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED SECOND CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

EXAMINING WHETHER THE NATION IS MEETING ITS EDUCATION GOALS AND TO REVIEW PROPOSALS TO REAUTHORIZE THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT, FOCUSING ON PROBLEMS AND REFORMS IN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION, STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION, AND ACCESS TO STUDENT FEDERAL AID PROGRAMS

JANUARY 9, 1991

Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources

HE 124 603

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

41-189 ⇆ WASHINGTON : 1991

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts, *Chairman*

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
TOM HARKIN, Iowa
BROCK ADAMS, Washington
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland
JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
PAUL D. WELLSTONE, Minnesota

ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah
NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM, Kansas
JIM JEFFORDS, Vermont
DAN COATS, Indiana
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
DAVE DURENBERGER, Minnesota
THAD COCHRAN, Mississippi

NICK LITTLEFIELD, *Staff Director and Chief Counsel*
KRISTINE A. IVERSON, *Minority Staff Director*

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 9, 1991

	Page
Diggins, Hameen, 8th grade, Shoemaker Middle School, Philadelphia, PA, accompanied by Bessie Carter, mother; and Anikee Ajagunna, senior, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ	3
Pell, Hon. Claiborne, a U.S. Senator from the State of Rhode Island, prepared statement	14
Romer, Hon. Roy, Governor, State of Colorado; Constance Clayton, superintendent, Philadelphia Public Schools, Philadelphia, PA; Floretta McKenzie, president, the McKenzie Group, Washington, DC; and Michael Timpane, president, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY	18
Prepared statements of:	
Governor Romer	21
Ms. Clayton	36
Ms McKenzie	43
Mr. Timpane	49
Bush, James L., sponsor of the "I Have A Dream" program at the Mather School, Dorchester, MA; Chester E. Finn, professor of education at Vanderbilt, and director of Educational Excellence Network, Washington, DC; and Robert L. Albright, president, Johnson C. Smith University, Charlotte, NC	68
Prepared statements of:	
Mr. Bush	71
Mr. Finn	75
Mr. Albright	89

CONDITION OF AMERICA'S SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 9, 1991

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:41 a.m., in room SD-430, Senator Edward M. Kennedy (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Senators Kennedy, Pell, Simon, Bingaman, Wellstone, Kassebaum, and Durenberger.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR KENNEDY

The CHAIRMAN. We will come to order.

This is the second in a series of hearing that the Labor Committee is holding to help set the committee's agenda for the coming Congress. As I said at the first hearing, the Nation's attention is clearly and properly focused on the Persian Gulf; but Americans are also suffering at home, and we must deal with their needs as well.

Too many citizens have already become victims of the economic downturn. Too many young people suffer in inadequate schools. Too many college students cannot get financial aid to meet the college bills. Too many American families suffer from inadequate health care.

Today, the committee will examine education issues. We all know where we are. American education is in a State of crisis. A decade after the effort to improve them began, our schools have changed very little. Consider a few of the facts.

One out of every four students leaves school without graduating. Nearly one-third of the Nation's secondary school students are enrolled in a math or science course taught by a teacher not qualified to teach that course. In an international study of 13-year-olds, the U.S. students ranked last in math proficiency. But 68 percent of the students said they were good at mathematics.

A year ago, the White House and the Governors laid out an ambitious set of educational goals for the Nation to achieve by the year 2000. These goals call for preparing children to be ready to start school. They call for increases in the high school graduation rate, for high levels of competency in challenging subjects, for making our students first in the world of math and science, for improvements in literacy and for eliminating drugs and violence from our schools.

Setting goals is the easy part. The hard part is achieving them. School districts can't do this alone. Students can't do it alone. The National Government can't mandate it. Our schools need help. Our communities need help. Our students need help. We must identify effective education programs and find efficient ways to pay for them.

When he was running for office, President Bush said he wanted to be the education President, but since he took office in 1989, education has largely disappeared from the agenda. The summit meeting with the Governors in Charlottesville and the establishment of national goals were commendable. But there has been no follow-up. The Nation is making far too little progress with respect to education goals. It's not just a question of money; it is also a question of political will.

In this morning's hearing, we are raising questions that must be answered by this Congress. What assistance is needed by elementary and secondary schools to achieve the national goals by the year 2000? What has been done so far to provide it? What can we do to improve access to higher education and encourage more students to pursue it?

We look forward to hearing from the experts and from the students who are here this morning, and we look forward to doing all we can to make this a productive education conference.

Senator Simon.

Opening Statement of Senator Simon

Senator Simon. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I applaud your having this series of hearings. There is no area where we are really determining what the future of this country is more than this field of education.

It is very interesting that in fiscal year 1949, when we had the GI Bill, we devoted 9 percent of our Federal budget to education. Today, if you exclude the school lunch program, we are devoting less than 4 percent of our Federal budget to education. Something is wrong. We simply have to invest in our future as we are not investing in our future today. We have to do a much, much better job.

Just one question for example. If you were to be asked which is the greater threat to our country today, a Soviet invasion of Western Europe or our inadequate attention to our schools, I think it is very clear that the greater threat is our inadequate attention to our schools. The Soviet threat has all but disappeared. And yet if you are to believe GAO figures, the Federal government is spending about seven times as much today for a threat of a Soviet invasion of Western Europe as we are on our schools. Something is out of whack.

You are right, Mr. Chairman, when you say setting goals isn't enough, but we haven't even set the goals. We have to set some goals, and then we have to fight for them. Under your leadership, I hope we can do precisely that.

The Chairman. Thank you very much.

I know we are expecting our chairman of our Education Committee, Senator Pell, who has been a real leader in education policy.

He will be joining us very shortly, and he has a keen interest in our hearings this morning.

Senator Wellstone had planned to be here as well. They are having an intelligence briefing on the gulf, which a number of our colleagues are attending at this time. I know Senator Bingaman has been particularly interested in the goals and how we are going to achieve them. I know he plans to be in here when he is freed from some of those other matters. So we welcome both their continued interest and involvement and leadership.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to welcome Hameen Diggins and his mother, Mrs. Bessie Carter, from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Hameen is a student in the 8th grade at Shoemaker Middle School and will tell us about a comprehensive student support service project he has been involved with.

Hameen, we are glad to have you here. Would you be good enough to join us? Have you ever testified in Congress before?

Mr. DIGGINS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we want you to feel right at home. You are among friends, and I know you have an interesting story to tell. We hope you will be very relaxed. We are interested in your story. I think you've got some idea what the hearing is about. We are trying to find out ways that we can be more supportive, with the kind of programs which I think you have experienced, and we want you to tell us a little bit about it in just a moment.

Then I want to welcome Anikee Ajagunna. We want to welcome you very much as well from eastern Maryland, a senior at Rutgers University. We are looking forward to hearing from you. We want to extend the warm good wishes of Senator Mikulski, who hoped to be able to make the hearing this morning and asked me to extend her good wishes.

Hameen, could you tell us a little bit about your age. How old are you?

STATEMENTS OF HAMEEN DIGGINS, 8TH GRADE, SHOEMAKER MIDDLE SCHOOL, PHILADELPHIA, PA, ACCOMPANIED BY BESSIE CARTER, MOTHER; AND ANIKEE AJAGUNNA, SENIOR, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY, NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ

Mr. DIGGINS. I am 15.

The CHAIRMAN. Bring that mike a little closer to you. You are 15 years old?

Mr. DIGGINS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Where do you live?

Mr. DIGGINS. Philadelphia, PA.

The CHAIRMAN. And you go to school there; is that right?

Mr. DIGGINS. Shoemaker Middle School.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you need to still lean in a little bit. Our sound system isn't quite as good as it could be.

Now, can you tell us a little bit about your own education experience, where you started off in school and then how you got here—do you have some comments to make?

Mr. DIGGINS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. OK. Maybe you would like to read through that and read it right into the mike, if you would be so kind.

Mr. DIGGINS. First of all, I would like to start off with a good morning. My name is Hameen Diggins. I am 15 years old and an 8th grade student at Shoemaker Middle School, District 4, in Philadelphia, PA. I come before you as a success story, one of many in our public schools. Often people only concentrate on the poor statistics, the students who are lost every year in our Nation's schools. They are not lost because of lack of instruction or the lack of caring by parents and teachers or the lack of students' desire to achieve, but they are lost because of the many problems that have invaded our schools, such as poverty, drugs, and health needs.

I consider myself one of the lucky students who have experienced success as a result of being serviced by my school's School Support Team under Comprehensive Student Support Services Project. This project has put together teachers and community people to help students overcome their problems and become all that they can be. No student is ever considered lost. Each of us is important in the school family, and our success becomes their success, our problems their problems. The beauty of the process is that the schools in District 4 have developed this so well that the support is there for the students even though I did not know that until I needed help.

My name came up to the school support team through the assistant principal, Mr. Cohen. I was a behavior problem in my classes, and my grades were poor. I followed friends that were having the same problems I was because at that time I felt that following the crowd gave me an identity and made me feel more important. And I always found myself in the middle of everything. You could say I was always in the wrong place at the wrong time with the wrong people. My attendance was good, not because I was really concerned about classes, but because I wanted to be with my friends. If not for Comprehensive Student Support Services, I could have continued along the same path. But through the school team process, the principal, vice-principal, counselor, and teachers met to discuss my needs and figure out how to help me turn my life around. The team included my parents in the discussion, listened to their concerns, and used their ideas to develop a program for me. They helped me to understand my goals and what it would take to reach them. Because of my poor grades, I couldn't participate in track, a sport which I always enjoyed.

I began to turn my life around. New friends replaced the old ones. We began to talk about what we wanted to do when we grew up. My coach, Mr. Stern, constantly encouraged me—sometimes in a very loud voice. But I know he believes in me and stays behind me to make sure that I keep on going. He never lets me quit. My physical education teacher, Mrs. Watson, is easy to talk to. I know she cares because she spends time with me. She was always on my back when I was in trouble to get my act together. She told me if I wanted to be somebody I had to get into my books. She can sense when something is wrong. She is fair. She is a friend to the students as well as a teacher. And both of these important teachers in my life have the support of the school support team to help me continue to achieve.

At the present, I am doing well in my classes. I now attend all my classes, not to make trouble but to make the grade. When I was called to the office on Monday, I said to myself, I know I must be

receiving an award of some kind because I know I haven't done anything wrong. [Laughter.]

I never dreamed that I would be in Washington, DC, talking about myself and my school support team. I enjoy science, physical education, and art, especially drawing cartoons and writing short stories to go with them. I was able to bring up my grades so that I could participate on the school's track team. During the last school year, our track team won the 4 x 4 relay race at the Penn Relays. My plans are to attend Overbrook High School in the magnet arts program. After completing high school, I would like to become a fashion designer and continue to improve my skills.

I have 4 brothers, 3 sisters. My mother, father, and my family are very close and supportive of one another.

Dr. Constance Clayton, superintendent of schools, has said that her students are children of value. Dr. Nancy Reid, District 4 superintendent, and Mrs. Janie Harris, Comprehensive Student Support Services Project manager, have made sure that the idea of comprehensive student support services has become a reality in our schools. I am a unique individual but not so much different than the thousands of others in our schools. There are many more students that are benefiting from comprehensive student support services. I know that this must continue so that others can have the same opportunities that I have had.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Let me ask you, as I understand, you had to repeat some grades on two different occasions. Is that right?

Mr. DIGGINS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you close to dropping out of school? Were you thinking about it?

Mr. DIGGINS. No, I wasn't thinking about dropping out of school. I just came to school to be with my friends.

The CHAIRMAN. Then at some time you got involved in this program that provided the comprehensive support services?

Mr. DIGGINS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How did you get into that?

Mr. DIGGINS. I was recommended by my house director and the assistant principal.

The CHAIRMAN. What is his name?

Mr. DIGGINS. The house director's name is Mr. Silverman, and the assistant principal is Mr. Cohen.

The CHAIRMAN. They ought to be part of this record. And what sort of things did the comprehensive services do? What was different about this school than going to school with the comprehensive services than going to school without them?

Mr. DIGGINS. Going to school without it, I could have kept on going in taking the wrong path. What it did was it helped me figure out what I am doing wrong, and they just talked to me about my problems. They just kept on my back telling me I got to get my work if I want to be somebody in life.

The CHAIRMAN. That was true in the classroom as well as in physical education; is that right?

Mr. DIGGINS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And now, as I understand, you are enjoying school?

Mr. DIGGINS. Yes. I am enjoying it. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. I would give the same answer. You know, I think all of us at various times feel that way.

How about sports? Are you doing well in sports?

Mr. DIGGINS. Track. I really like track. I collected trophies and medals and plaques.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you run?

Mr. DIGGINS. I run the 200 in the 4 x 4 relay.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you do the 200 in?

Mr. DIGGINS. Like a dash. I compete against other people from other schools.

The CHAIRMAN. And you win your share of the races?

Mr. DIGGINS. Yes, I always win my share of the races.

The CHAIRMAN. You want to go on to college?

Mr. DIGGINS. Yes. That is what I want to do.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what you want to do.

Well, Mrs. Carter, you must be very proud of your son.

Mrs. Carter. Yes, I am.

The CHAIRMAN. You have other members of the family here, as I understand. Do you want to just introduce them? We are glad to have them here. Hameen, do you want to introduce them? Is your dad back there?

Mr. DIGGINS. Right there.

The CHAIRMAN. Welcome, Dad. And you have a sister. Do you want to introduce her? Very good.

Well, we appreciate your testimony because I think as a society we are trying to figure out how we can deal with what is a major challenge to the country, and that is to strengthen and improve the quality of education. When we use those words, what we are really talking about is the life experience of you and so many of our fellow Americans across this country. Unless someone has that inner desire to try and improve themselves, you know, there is obviously very little we can do. But if they do have a desire—and clearly you do—and if we try and provide the kinds of support, give people a chance, there is no limit to what we can do. Quite frankly, as you comment about this program, I think you shouldn't minimize your own kind of internal strength and your own courage in dealing with these challenges. I know it hasn't been easy. So we just want to congratulate you, and I hope many of our other young people across the country can take some inspiration from your own story.

Senator Simon.

Senator SIMON. I just wanted to join in commending you, Hameen. I can't help but recall, Mr. Chairman, that it wasn't 2 or 3 years ago we had the superintendent of schools of Philadelphia here talking about the pre-school program that they have and what marvelous results they had from that. Then I asked her, "What percentage of the young people are you reaching who really need help in that intensive pre-school program?" She said about 20 percent.

You have somehow caught that spark of hope, Hameen, that a lot of your friends don't have. What makes the difference? How can we give that spark of hope to others? Do you have any ideas?

Mr. DIGGINS. Start more programs for the other students so they don't keep going on the wrong path. They can do the same thing I did.

Senator SIMON. I am just told that the superintendent that testified earlier is here. That is Connie Clayton. You are in the second panel.

Ms. CLAYTON. I am delighted you remembered.

Senator SIMON. All right. Thank you. I didn't even look down there.

Well, we are very, very proud of you, and I couldn't help but note as you were testifying, just over your right shoulder there I could see the Governor of Colorado. And as you mentioned what your hopes are, I thought someday you might be working for the Governor of Colorado. But then you mentioned you wanted to become a fashion designer, and I don't know if he needs a fashion designer. [Laughter.] But we wish you the very best, and we congratulate not only you but your mother and your father and your sister who is there to take a picture of you to show that you don't always keep the best of company. We are very proud of you, Hameen.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Anikee, we are delighted to have you here this morning, and we look forward to your comments and testimony. You are a senior and philosophy major at Rutgers, originally from Easton, MD. Perhaps you would tell us a little bit about the complexities of the challenges which you and your family have faced in trying to have an individual who is qualified for student aid and assistance and the difficulties that you are facing, because we are going to be reauthorizing the higher education bill and we want to try to find out from a student what is happening out there in the real world. We appreciate your coming here, particularly on short notice.

Ms. AJAGUNNA. Thank you very much, Senator Kennedy and Senator Simon. My name is Anikee Ajagunna, and as Senator Kennedy said, I am originally from Easton, MD. I am also a member of the United States Student Association Board of Governors, and we try to work for these kinds of things. And we are working on reauthorization this year, so it is really important for us to get a voice.

I grew up in a single-income family, and despite our moderate income, I was unable to get a Pell grant. And I received no State aid or minimal institution aid, but I do receive aid from my college through the college work-study program. But, as you know, college work-study doesn't apply directly to your tuition or student fees. It is just like money that you make along through the school year.

Because my mother and I were forced to rely on the Federal student aid program to help finance my education, I have already borrowed $15,000 over the last 4 years in guaranteed student loans, and at 8 percent interest I am going to be paying back over $16,000 over I don't know how long. I haven't had my exit interview yet, so I don't know how long it is going to take me to pay back that money.

I also have Perkins loans, and I have one of those for each year at about $1,000 a year. And I think the interest rate on that is about 5 percent. On top of that, because we didn't have the liquid

assets for my mother to pay the money straight out from any savings or anything, she has a PLUS loan. The PLUS loan is about 12 percent, and she has borrowed $16,000 in the PLUS loan. Because even though I go to Rutgers University, which is a State-funded university, it is quite expensive because I am not a New Jersey resident.

I have to say that the system is very difficult to understand. We filed all the forms at the right deadlines and everything, but unless you are really familiar with the way the system works, it can be really difficult. We got initial aid from high school guidance counselors that give you the basic information, but they don't always know the intricacies of how the whole system works, the Federal information and the State information and then how the institution processes all the information.

Once, my mother called the Rutgers University financial aid office to inquire about discrepancies between the loan disbursement dates and the term bill deadlines, and she was told that if she did not have the money to pay the bill when the bill was due that she might as well just send her child to a different institution. We didn't understand exactly why that was a problem. We found out that what had happened was that the date that the banks release the loan checks is after the date that the bill was due. So if you don't have the money when the bill is due, you can't start school. But if you had the money in the first place, you would just pay it. But the reason we applied for the loan is because we didn't have the money.

So the fact of the matter was we were kind of like in a catch. So we ended up going on the open market and getting a loan to pay the bill immediately between the time that we applied for the loan and the time the money for the loan actually arrived, which really, really hurts because the reason why you apply for student loans and Federally funded loans like the PLUS program is because they are at lower interest rates than the open market loans.

The CHAIRMAN. How long is that period?

Ms. AJAGUNNA. The money usually comes about 4 weeks after the bill—well, actually about 4 weeks after school starts. The bills are usually due about a month before school starts.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that true every year?

Ms. AJAGUNNA. Every year, yes. But the first time we had this problem was my second year of school, and we didn't realize it. We had applied before all the deadlines, and way before. My mother files her taxes or she fills out the forms like in January, as soon as the forms come, and fills out the facts and sends them off to the scholastic services or whatever.

What had happened, like about a week before or 2 weeks before the bill was due, we were, like, Where's the money for the loan so we could pay the bill? And it hadn't come. So we called the bank, and they were, like, well, it doesn't get disbursed yet. So we called the university financial aid office to say the bank says the money doesn't come until such-and-such a time. Can we get credited because it is already approved and everything? And they are, like, no, you have to pay the bill. But we didn't have the money. That is why we applied for the loan. And they are, like, well, that's not our problem. That is your problem.

So we were kind of dumfounded that that was an issue. So what we ended up doing is like I said, borrowing money on the open market. My mother belongs to a credit union, and she got a deal through them. But if she didn't have a good credit rating, we would not have been able to get a loan, and then I wouldn't have been in school that semester.

The CHAIRMAN. Why didn't you try another bank?

Ms. AJAGUNNA. Well, basically what happens is they discourage you from going to multiple lenders?

The CHAIRMAN. Who is "they"?

Ms. AJAGUNNA. The financial aid services at my institution at the university. I was told once when I was applying for a loan for summer—because I went to school over one summer and I applied for a guaranteed student loan—that I couldn't borrow from multiple lenders. I had to borrow from the same lender. I have been told since then that that is not true. But I suppose what they were trying to do was strongly encourage me to borrow from the same lender over and over again. I think it had something to do with it is easier to repay the money back. But you don't understand that because the forms aren't clearly marked, and there are different forms for a lot of the same things, same forms for lots of different things, and similar forms for totally different things.

It is like you really don't know. I am a senior, and I have gone through this process numerous times, and it seems as if you would like know how to do it after the first or the second time, that it would become a pattern. But it always seems like there are these loopholes, these things you kind of miss and everything. And my mother is really, really efficient, and she fills these forms out. She double-checks them, triple-checks them, quadruple-checks them, sends them out, makes sure everything is in its place, and all the t's are crossed and the i's are dotted. But it still doesn't seem like it is a smooth process. Always something comes up.

So I tried to explain this to someone the other day, and it seemed really, really confusing. But what happened, when we did borrow that money outside of the Federal aid system and we paid the bill, then when the money came we didn't need to use it because we had already paid the bill. So we saved that money for the next time and paid the next bill because the other money wouldn't come in time, just like before. So we kept doing that each year because we had the money from the previous time—are you following what I am saying? I am sorry. I know it sounds really convoluted, and it is kind of like you have to manipulate the system to make it work for you. But that is the only way we had to make things kind of come together.

Now I am graduating, and I am going to owe over $20,000 in loan money myself, and my mother has just finished paying off the first PLUS loan, which was $4,000. We just finished at the end of 1990, and she still has three more to go. So that is another $12,000 she still has to pay back. And I have to go find a job to start paying this money back. I don't know exactly how I am going to do it and eat and live and all those good things.

I was asked to talk about the complexity of the program. I don't know if I clarified that.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you spelled it out pretty well. [Laughter.] That is helpful.

I have the FAF application form. You have here several pages within another. This is the advisory book; the instruction book. You know, this is close to a 1040, what people pay their taxes with, and there are a number of Americans that have to hire accountants in order to try and get those done. They expect people and families to weave their way through this, and this is just one application. This isn't even the GSL.

Ms. AJAGUNNA. No, and the GSL is huge.

The CHAIRMAN. That is another one.

Ms. AJAGUNNA. It is really huge, and then the Perkins loan and then the PLUS loan.

The CHAIRMAN. So you have all of these that you have to weave your way through, and then you have the difference between the time that the institutions are asking for the resources and the time that they are coming in, and the burden that that places on families.

Ms. AJAGUNNA. Yes. It would be great if the institution said, okay, your bill is not due until the first day of school, but even then the money wouldn't come in time. It is like they somehow purposely don't give you the money until after school starts, thinking that if you don't really need the money you won't take the money, or something. I don't understand why that happens. But it seems totally absurd to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Do different lenders use different applications and request different information?

Ms. AJAGUNNA. Well, like the form that I picked up from the bank that I usually get the money from and the form that I picked up in New Jersey to get the one loan for the summer weren't the same because I tried to use the old form to transfer the information so it would be really accurate. But it wasn't the same information. Some of the information they asked me for I hadn't been asked for before, so I didn't have it on hand and it wasn't readily accessible. And so the form wasn't completed as simply as I thought it would be. So the answer to that question is no, they are not the same. They are different.

The CHAIRMAN. This obviously is complex and places a burden on all the borrowers. Do your fellow students have the same problems? Do they talk about that?

Ms. AJAGUNNA. Yes. A great proportion of the students I go to school with have some sort of loan assistance, and they get their loans from different institutions, not the same institution I do because mine is in Maryland. But they do have some of the same problems.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any ideas what could be done to help students understand the process? Or should the whole process, as I gather it, be simplified?

Ms. AJAGUNNA. Yes. It is kind of like putting a band-aid on it. I think we should try to kind of revamp the process.

I noticed that one of the things I had forgotten, one of my, like, assistance, was the Perkins loan because it was one of those that I don't really have a problem with. Because when I fill out my financial aid form and the institutional form, it is already processed for

me, and it is a really simple thing. You don't have to fill out tons and tons of paperwork. If you qualify for it, you get it, and then you just go into the financial aid office, sign your promissory note, and it is done. And you don't have to go through the bank and wait; you don't have to get the form from the bank, fill out the form, take it to the financial aid office, pick it up at the financial aid office, send it back to the bank, and wait for the bank to send it back to you. Everything is done already. It is just like one clean thing.

So I think if the other loan programs were like that, it would be a lot better for all of us. It would be great if there weren't loan program but there were grant programs. We wouldn't have to worry about paying the money back. But, you know, I guess you can only ask for so much.

The CHAIRMAN. That's not unreasonable.

Let me ask, what would have happened if your family was not able to borrow the money to help you in that interim period, from the time school started and the time you got the money?

Ms. AJAGUNNA. Right. Well, for that time I wouldn't have been at school that semester. I would have been working, and when the money came, I would have saved it and applied it to the following semester and just lost a semester in between. That was the only option I had.

The CHAIRMAN. Finally, what is the explanation of why the checks are late?

Ms. AJAGUNNA. Well, no, they are not late. They are scheduled to come then. They are not scheduled to come when you need them. The university tells you that the system says that the disbursement date is on such-and-such a date.

The CHAIRMAN. And the schools tell you that you have to have it here and the banks tell you that you have to have it there?

Ms. AJAGUNNA. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And they are disjointed.

Ms. AJAGUNNA. That is just it. They are disjointed. They do not meet any place at any time.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Simon.

Senator SIMON. First of all, we thank you for your testimony. If I may give a plug to your university, the collected works of Abraham Lincoln are not published by the University of Illinois Press or Southern Illinois University Press. They are published by the Rutgers University Press.

Ms. AJAGUNNA. Lovely. Thank you.

Senator SIMON. People kind of chuckled when you said, "I'd prefer to have a grant." But the reality is in the last 10 years we have shifted student aid, where it used to be a majority grant, to now where it is a majority loan program.

Ms. AJAGUNNA. Yes, definitely.

Senator SIMON. And the Grace Commission has pointed out that that, believe it or not, costs us more money in the long run.

Ms. AJAGUNNA. Really? Well, I know it cost me more money in the long run because if I could afford to pay the money outright, then it would cost me less. Since I don't have the funds to do it, I have to take these loans. That means I have to pay back the money with interest. So all of my fellow students who are lucky enough to

have the cash can pay the flat rate. I have to pay the inflated rate with the interest costs plus the repayment plan costs. So, yes, it definitely would be better for me. And I guess the other thing is that—I don't remember what the other thing is.

Senator SIMON. All right. When you graduate, you are going to owe about $20,000.

Ms. AJAGUNNA. Yes.

Senator SIMON. Your mother has borrowed $16,000.

Ms. AJAGUNNA. Right.

Senator SIMON. $36,000, that is a tremendous barrier to a lot of people from going to school.

Ms. AJAGUNNA. Of course it is.

Senator SIMON. What is happening, it is not only that your family now can't get the Pell grant——

Ms. AJAGUNNA. Well, you know, it is kind of interesting you mention the Pell grant because the amount of money that my family makes says I don't get a Pell grant. I don't really know if that really means I don't qualify for a Pell grant because basically it's like—they used to have something for middle income, and if you slide the scale from 1978 until now, they would be like almost $10,000 more than what my family makes, and I would qualify for a Pell grant. But since it doesn't allow for the middle income, I don't.

Senator SIMON. Well, what we have been doing—not with my vote— is squeezing down eligibility for families. Plus we have done one other thing: Pell grants used to take care of over 40 percent of the costs of going to college; now a Pell grant takes care of, on the average, 26 percent of going to college. So we have really been putting the squeeze on a lot of people.

Let me ask you this: Not only is your mother now paying back the $16,000, but when you get out of school, what will you have to pay per month? Do you have any idea?

Ms. AJAGUNNA. I don't know yet. They set up exit interviews with you at the financial aid office in the spring, and they let you know how much you are going to have to pay back per year. I have a friend who was in a similar situation but not quite as much money, and for the first 2 years he was paying $400 a month.

Senator SIMON. How much a month?

Ms. AJAGUNNA. $400 a month. So I don't know what mine is going to be like.

Senator SIMON. And let's just assume because yours is a little greater, let's say it's $500 a month, and let's do a little imagining here, let's say you get married to a student who also has a similar loan. So you owe $1,000 a month. Then you have to make a decision about getting a home, having a family, and those dreams get——

Ms. AJAGUNNA. Well, those aren't options at this point. They are definitely not options. Those aren't options until way after this debt is kind of like off my shoulders.

Senator SIMON. But our excessive reliance on loans postpones those things.

Ms. AJAGUNNA. Of course. I can't think about those kinds of things. I have to be really practical. I have to think about trying to get a job that is going to give me the income to pay back these

loans, not specifically something I just want to do out of my own needs and wants, or going to grad school like I would like to do, because I have to think about paying back this debt. My family can't incur any more debt.

Senator SIMON. What are you majoring in?

Ms. AJAGUNNA. Philosophy.

Senator SIMON. Philosophy. OK. Now, it is tough to be a philosophy major and face this kind of a loan burden.

Ms. AJAGUNNA. Sure.

Senator SIMON. At some point you had to be thinking maybe I ought to switch to a business major or something else.

Ms. AJAGUNNA. Yes, but I am there to get the education that I desire, you know? It is really sad to say I have to groom my needs for education to my need for financial assistance. I should be able to get the education that I want to get. That is what has driven me to put myself in this much debt. I didn't just say, okay, I don't mind putting myself in this much debt just for the heck of it. It was a long, drawn-out discussion in my household: Do we want to do this? Is this the kind of path we want to take? Do you want to take the chance to make this major investment? And the answer to that question was yes, but, you know, at these consequences.

Senator SIMON. No question about it. But let's take two different fields. Let's say that you were trying to decide do you become a social worker or do you get an accounting major. You know and I know which one of those two can get more pay.

Ms. AJAGUNNA. Right.

Senator SIMON. And what the loan program does if you are just slightly inclined to become a social worker, if you face that $20,000 loan, you shift.

Ms. AJAGUNNA. Yes, definitely. A lot of students do. A lot of students do. It is like I can't do that because it is not going to pay the bills. I am hoping, I guess, for something very badly.

Senator SIMON. I understand. Then one final point, and I appreciate the tolerance of the committee here. One other thing, we have made a lot of progress in our society in my lifetime, and I am pleased with the progress in terms of opportunities for minorities and women. But it is still true that those of us who are white males, when we graduate from college, on the average are going to earn more than those who are women and those who are members of minority groups, so that there is a discriminatory factor in a loan program. It is easier for white males to repay those loans than it is for women and members of minority groups. And it is something, as we look to reauthorization, that we ought to keep in mind.

My hope is that your United States Student Association will be very, very active in this coming year as we face this reauthorization in higher education. We ought to do something more than just tinker with the Higher Education Act. We ought to dream. We ought to set some goals for this country that can lift this Nation by putting opportunities instead of barriers in front of students.

Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. AJAGUNNA. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Kassebaum.

Senator KASSEBAUM. Mr. Chairman, my apologies. I was not here to hear the panel, and so I don't feel I can ask any real questions at this point. I would just like to say, from the few comments that I have heard, Ms. Ajagunna, that you spoke to something that I think troubles us all, the complexities of the student loan program. We will be addressing this in the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. Something that has troubled me that I understand you talked about was the counselor's advice to you in high school. Is that correct? You didn't feel that you got some of the counseling that may have been useful to you as far as what opportunities there were or what student loans might be available and how best to put this all together?

Ms. AJAGUNNA. Well, in my high school, the guidance counselor did provide really good fundamental information about the student aid programs, about the statewide—especially about the State funding. But since I didn't go to a school in my State, most of those things didn't apply to me. So then they gave me like how to fill out—basically how to fill out the financial aid form, but I don't think anyone really understood how intricate the whole process was going to become once I got entangled in these loan programs.

Senator KASSEBAUM. I clearly think this is something that is troubling for everyone, and I very much appreciate your speaking to it so succinctly this morning.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Since I came in late, I won't ask any further questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Let us hear now from Senator Pell, who is the chairman of our Education Subcommittee.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR PELL

Senator PELL. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I came in late, too, so I can't address any specific questions, just to say I am very glad that this hearing is being held. As we can see, from what I have heard so far, the question of access and quality are the two goals that we are concerned with. And what Ms. Ajagunna pointed out is the importance of having more grants, to my mind, and fewer loans. And this ratio which once was about 2 or 3 to 1 in favor of grants over loans has now exactly reversed itself. I would hope as we move into the reauthorization process we keep that very much in mind.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Senator Pell follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR PELL

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend you at the outset for holding this important hearing and I must emphasize as we begin our agenda for the 102nd Congress that we must continue to focus upon quality and upon access as a twin, inseparable effort. To provide an excellent education without affording every American adequate access to that quaility runs directly contrary to our democratic responsibilities. Conversely, to focus upon access without ensuring that the access is to an excellent education does a disservice to our students, and to our Nation.

I welcome an examination this morning of the condition of our schools. This snapshot I am certain will be dominated by educational failure and inadequacy. However, in that picture, let us not lose sight of the fact that there are many beacons of excellence,. There are in fact many schools in impoverished areas, in urban areas and in rural areas where the bright spirit of educational excellence has sprouted through the cement of inadequate resources, historical educational failure and diminished hopes. The task before us as I see it is to make those examples the norm rather than the exception, and to find ways that weill encourage and enable schools and educators across the Nation to provide the highest quality education to all citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Durenberger.

Senator DURENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, first I want to thank you for this hearing and for the opportunity to be here. Second, I appreciate the witnesses coming here toay. I have a hard time imagining myself at their age doing what they are doing. I guess they don't make assumptions about us and this environment that a lot of people do. I think the comfort with which they approach the testimony here today is certainly a tribute not only to them but to the work that you propose we do.

I just came from the inauguration of our new Governor in Minnesota, and it occurred to me, as I listened to him speak, that Minnesota is going to have another education Governor. His predecessor was an education Governor, and his predecessor was an education Governor, and his predecessor was a fairly famous Congressman who made his reputation in education and became an education Governor. It strikes me that we have been trying very hard in America, probably before these two young people were born, to address a problem that we have so much difficulty getting our hands around.

I wanted to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that this committee has an incredible amount of authorizing responsibility. But the thing that it seems to do best under your leadership is to take on these seemingly insoluble problems by starting with understanding them. I accept the challenge during the 102nd Congress to do everything that I can. Coming from a State that has always prided itself on being in the forefront of education—now it is in the forefront of choice—I was thinking, should I ask some questions about choice in education, and do you two really feel you have any choice. As you reflect backwards, if you think back, what choices did you really have in terms of what you were going to do, where you were going to go to school, what teachers you were going to have, how you defined education, how your family helped you define education. Or was it just expected that you go from here to there, this is the teacher you get, this is the classroom you get and this is the education you get.

I am sort of curious. We can talk about choice in a variety of ways, as we do in my State. We talk about people having choices at the high school level of choosing to take higher education courses for example, and various people talk about choice in other ways. I keep coming back to the question does the person involved who is getting the education really have any choice in what it is that they want in education and where they are going to go get it?

Maybe if either of you would like to reflect on your sense of choices you have had in the systems, I would sure appreciate that.

Ms. AJAGUNNA. I would like to say something kind of reflected to like his situation as far as choice is concerned. I don't know what kind of choices he is going to have by the time he gets out of high school as far as higher education is concerned. I don't know if, like Senator Pell says, we will be able to do anything about the grant program so that it won't be as difficult for him and his parents to fund his education, or if it is going to be even more difficult and education will be even more inaccessible. I am hoping for the best. I hope it is going to get better, but it seems that it is going to get worse before it gets better. So I hope he gets to design school and all those great things, but I don't necessarily see it happening. And for me, the choice was going to school where I wanted to go to school and putting myself in debt, or not doing what I wanted to do. And I guess a lot of people don't get to do what they want to do.

Senator DURENBERGER. Did you have a choice of kindergarten? Did you have a choice of 1st grade, 2nd grade, 3rd grade, 8th grade, 9th grade?

Ms. AJAGUNNA. Well, I had a choice to go to school—well, no, honestly, I didn't have a choice to go to school or not to go to school. I had an educational advocate in my household. My mother is a school teacher, and there was no ifs, ands, or buts about it. It is school, college, work, da, da, da, so on and so forth. There was no choice. In a lot of households, there aren't educational advocates, and people don't necessarily see college as an automatic option. I think that should be more the point.

It seems as though sometimes kids get tracked in schools, and they don't have choices. And they get tracked out of academic paths, and so they don't even get the option of deciding whether or not they want to go on to any form of higher education, be it at universities or a type of vocational training.

Senator DURENBERGER. But even before you get to higher education, how many people really have a choice? Particularly, how many people who are, in effect, ghetto-ized in terms of where they are raised and where their family lives and so forth——

Ms. AJAGUNNA. No, they don't have choices——

Senator DURENBERGER. What kind of choice do they have at age 8, age 10, age 12, age 14, age 16?

Ms. AJAGUNNA. Well, at age 8, if you don't know that college is an option, or high school is really something that you should want to achieve, then it is not out there for you as a choice. And your choice is drugs in the street or your choice is being a mother very early or your choice is working in a factory. Your choice isn't going and dealing with the rigors of education.

Senator DURENBERGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the mothers, your mother and Mrs. Carter, deserve a lot of credit, and I think Senator Durenberger just suggests that we have so many young people in this country that don't have the benefits of having that mother or parent at home. They may be working. They may have other kinds of challenges or difficulties to try and give the kinds of guidance and inspiration.

This takes nothing away from either one of you. I must say I commend both of you. One of my favorite sayings from Shakespeare is "Perseverance, Lord, make honor bright," and I think both of you have demonstrated your own perseverance over some difficult times. You have done an extraordinary job.

Let me just say in conclusion, one of the challenges that we are going to face is to make these education programs work for the student and not the banks. I will stop at that. We will look for guidance from the United States Student Association for whatever suggestions to the extent that they can help and give us some guidance and advice on this.

Second, I will talk to our colleagues. I think what we ought to try and do is to get these various applications, invite our Republican friends, and try to get some of the financial aid offices and some accountants down there and see how we can simplify it. You know, the financial aid offices obviously have interest. Students have interest. But there ought to be a way of doing it, whether we have the technical kinds of skills as members of this committee in terms of these types of things, we can do the best we can. But I hope we can ask our staffs working with financial offices, working with students to find out some kind of way to make some sense out of this. This is still along the edges, and we are not dealing with the kinds of issues that Senator Simon and Senator Pell talked about, which I feel strongly about as well. But to the extent that we do have this program and it is out there, we are going to do everything we can to respond to some of these challenges.

We thank the panel all very much for being here. Again, we express our appreciation for your testimony. We will hopefully profit from it and do something about it for other young people. Thank you very much.

We want to extend a warm welcome to Roy Romer, Governor of Colorado. He is also co-lead Governor for education representing the National Governors' Association and chairman of the National Education Goals Panel. Yesterday, Roy Romer was inaugurated for his second term as Governor. Congratulations. Tomorrow he will deliver the State of the State message in Denver. So inaugurated yesterday, speaking tomorrow, here today, obviously a reflection of his own extraordinary deep-seated commitment to the whole issue of education. That doesn't surprise us. We have known the Governor over a long period of time; very committed to public service and dedicated to public service.

I think most of us on this committee have had the chance to talk with you privately and know of your own sincere commitment and the leadership you are providing. And we want to welcome you here this morning.

We have Connie Clayton back before the committee. We are always glad to have her. Ms. Clayton is superintendent of Philadelphia Public Schools, president-elect of the Council of the Great City Schools. It is a wonderful organization that I had the good opportunity to work with. You testified here 2 years ago about early education. I want you to know we benefited from that program. We have made some progress in that in the last Congress that you are familiar with.

Floretta McKenzie is president of The McKenzie Group, an education consulting firm. Dr. McKenzie was superintendent of the District of Columbia Public Schools from 1981 to 1988, served as deputy assistant secretary for the Office of School Improvement in the Education Department from 1979 to 1981. In the spring of 1990, Dr. McKenzie was a visiting professor of Harvard University's Graduate School of Education.

Michael Timpane is president of Teachers College at Columbia University and director of the National Institute of Education from 1979 to 1981, and a former researcher of the Rand Corporation. We are glad to have you.

Governor, we welcome your comments.

STATEMENTS OF HON. ROY ROMER, GOVERNOR, STATE OF COLORADO; CONSTANCE CLAYTON, SUPERINTENDENT, PHILADELPHIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS, PHILADELPHIA, PA; FLORETTA MCKENZIE, PRESIDENT, THE MCKENZIE GROUP, WASHINGTON, DC; AND MICHAEL TIMPANE, PRESIDENT, TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK, NY

Governor ROMER. Thank you. I am very pleased to be here. I am aware of the time restrictions, and I would like to, in the course of the formal presentation and questions, get to the heart of this business of the national goals and accountability. It is an interesting experiment. Let me begin.

When I first saw the national goals, I was apprehensive. I am fearful of overstatement and underachievement. I was fearful of rhetoric and no action. And some of those goals are stated almost in a symbolic way, first in the world of math and science by the year 2000. I stay away from those kinds of generalized statements that may be—well, just let me end there.

When I saw them, I did realize that they are going to serve a great purpose, and that is that we need to call this Nation into action. We are a long ways from where we ought to be. Therefore, I accept the goals. I accept them enthusiastically. I think that we can do a lot over a 10-year period.

Then a panel was put together to monitor the progress. I am Chair of that panel. I have been a member of the panel for 3 years. I take that assignment very seriously. In the course of this morning's testimony, I would like to tell you what I think our job is and how we are doing it.

First of all, the goals are important. They are very generalized. The first step we need to do is to—well, first, let's ask why we are doing this. Why we are doing it really is to say where ought we to be, where are we now, and what changes do we need to make to get there. That is the essential formula that we are working on. Where ought we to be? Where are we now? And what changes do we need to make to get there?

Now, the goals themselves say where we want to be in a very general way, but we need to translate that into levels of achievement. We need to be much more specific about, and the goals are six in nature. The first one, obviously, readiness to school; the second one, attendance; the third and the fourth refer to academic

achievement in math and science particularly; the fifth refers to illiteracy; and the sixth to drugs and violence.

It is a powerful instrument that we are working with, and let me describe why. We are going to hold a report card session in September of this year in which we will ask each State to give us a report as to where that State is in reference to those six goals. Then we are going to try to give a composite report of where the Nation is.

Now, just in framing the questions to each State Governor and the Governor willing to answer the questions is a very significant step. If you as panel members, Members of the Senate, would just simply think with me, what would be the five most critical questions you would ask Governors on the goal every child should be ready for school, the mere asking of that question begins to say that is our priority. That is a very significant objective that we sort out from others that we might State in terms of getting a child ready for school. So the power in this National Goals Panel in many ways is 50 Governors who have agreed to, on an annual basis, account for where they are. And so our job is to format that report card and figure out what are the indicators that really give us an accurate measure and find out how to State those questions to each State, and then motivate those States to give us that report.

Now, we obviously want to do this in a way in which we do not compare Minnesota to Mississippi. We want to compare Minnesota to a base and measure its progress over 10 years so that we will be fair about it. Now, in order just to put that operation into place, let me just use a simple panel here. We need to do three steps. We need to first be more specific on levels of achievement. That is, if we are going to measure what a youngster should be able to do and know at Grade 4, 8, and 12 in math, we need to know what is that level of achievement that we have consensus on nationally. The second step then is to find an assessment method that is accurate and authentic, and there is a lot of problems in terms of assessment methods that we are currently using. And the third step is use these steps 1 and 2 to change the system.

Now, therefore, we have a lot of work cut out for ourselves, in each subject matter area and at each grade level, to find what are the levels of achievement, what are the authentic assessment methods, and how do we change the system.

Now, when I took this assignment, I tried to identify the most important barrier to overcome, and I concluded it was this: It was this ideological problem in this country of our great tradition of local control of education, yet our need now to arrive at a national consensus upon educational goals and levels of achievement. Or, stated another way, our movement toward site-based management, which is obviously very local in control, and our movement toward holding ourselves accountable as a Nation, which I think we need to do.

Now, how can we do that? If you will again look at this panel, levels of achievement in national goals is on the national side; changing the system is local. Therefore, as we move from what I think everybody has agreed upon, yes, we ought to have national goals, I think we then can take the next step. Yes, we can arrive at

a consensus as to what levels of achievement in math ought to be in 4th, 8th and 12th.

But the next step—that is, how do we assess it—we run into real problems because there is great resistance to have "a national test" to the people who would fear that that would lead to a national curriculum. So one of the challenges in front of us is how do we put this system together in which we can accomplish that.

I would like to throw out just one of the methods that might be done, and it will give you somewhat of an indication of the character of the work we are doing. That method is, again, illustrated by another drawing that I have made which is a cluster. If you take the challenge of how are we going to find national accountability, at the same time preserve local control in that tradition of local control, one way to do it would be the following: Do not have a single national test for 4th graders on math or science or language. We go to a group of States, say eight or ten, and say call yourself Group 1, develop the test, develop a really authentic test to measure what we want to measure. Do it together, do it collectively, do it as a consortium. It will save you money. You don't each of you have to reinvent the wheel. You can associate yourself not geographically. It may be in terms of the patterns of educational practice in your relative States or the size of the States. But if you had clusters of States developing those tests, then have those tests correlated, calibrated, so that we can tell what a national result would be even though we had four or five individual tests being used, that can be done. You can have separate tests but have them calibrated where the standard of achievement which the test is testing can be agreed upon with some national consensus. In that way, we might be able to develop over a period of time a method where we can report this is where we are, in the 4th grade, the 8th grade, and the 12th grade in various subject matter areas, and at the same time not have a federated system.

Now, that idea is based, frankly, on the English system. In England, they have a series of panels that prepare tests, and a school can choose to associate with one panel or another. This would leave choice to the States. The State of Connecticut could say, hey, I want to go and join this panel or this one or that one.

Now, that is simply one of the problems that we are going to have to work through over a period of time. Another one is the authenticity of the tests. What do tests really indicate? Finally, we want to use this process of setting achievement levels and accurate assessment to change the system. And here we need to have the buy-in of the people who really do manage the system, and it is State and local.

That is why I will conclude by saying that the composition of this panel is a unique one. It has six Governors, four Members of Congress, four from the White House, and I think one of the more important compositions of it is the Governor's role. Because if a Governor is willing to sign on and say I will be accountable and a part of this process, I think over a period of time the forces within that State will take seriously this business of accountability.

Finally, I think you know what we are dealing with here. We are dealing with outcomes. For many years, many of us have been working on how we can put better inputs into the system. You

spoke of one this morning in terms of educational grants. But I think it is time that we do come to terms with how can we measure accurately where we are in an authentic way, and use those outcome measures, criterion-based, to say, hey, we no longer can fool ourselves. If we are going to be competitive in the world, if we are going to raise our skill levels, we need to have a methodology to do it.

I would be most happy to answer questions of the Senate after the other members have spoken.

[The prepared statement of Governor Romer follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ROY ROMER, GOVERNOR OF COLORADO

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify before the Labor and Human Resources Committee. I am pleased to be with you today in Washington, DC. Yesterday, I was inaugurated for my second term as Governor of Colorado. Tomorrow, I deliver my 1991 State of the State message in Denver. All of these communications focus on the critical importance of a strong public education system to our future. All reflect my personal sense of urgency about the need for much higher levels of achievement and for dramatic reform.

It is an honor to be with all of you who, I know, share my strong commitment to achieving educational excellence.

I am here today wearing three different hats: Governor of Colorado, co-lead governor for education representing the National Governors' Association (NGA) and chairman of the National Education Goals Panel. Since the subject of this hearing is the national education goals, I want to begin with a short history of how the goals came to be and the actions that have been taken to date to build our capacity to achieve them.

Last year, the NGA Chairman, Governor Terry Branstad of Iowa, made education a top priority by establishing a task force to develop national goals and to recommend practical ways to achieve those goals. At the same time, President Bush invited the Nation's 50 governors to participate in an unprecedented education summit. This event between the nation's governors and the President of the United States underscored the governors' long-term commitment to reform the education system and to build widespread support for necessary reforms.

At the summit, we made four major commitments:

1. To establish national education goals;
2. To develop strategies for helping achieve those goals, including seeking greater flexibility and enhanced accountability at the Federal, State and local levels;
3. To undertake a major State-by-State effort to restructure the education system; and
4. To report annually on progress in achieving the goals.

NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS

In establishing the national goals, it was our intention to develop an ambitious set of performance goals that would provide a common framework and vision for educational reform. As governors, we wanted to be clear that we were committing ourselves to making education a priority in each of our states and were willing to be held accountable for this commitment. In fact, we demanded to be held accountable. The country needed to understand clearly that in order to remain internationally competitive, we must improve educational outcomes—cradle to grave.

The goals have been criticized as too ambitious. In my judgment, they accurately identify what our reach must be to make the kind of progress that is required to secure our future.

The goals are not gospel. They are not perfect. But, they do provide a common vision, a common way to organize reform issues, and a common language. We applaud the efforts of organizations like the Council of Great City Schools who have taken 'the goals and adapted them to specific contexts, such as urban schools.

Many States and local school districts have adopted their own versions of the goals. Education summits were held in many States over the past 18 months. In my own State, we held five regional meetings on State and national education goals. In this way, the goals have played, and will continue to play, an important catalytic role in bringing the necessary stakeholders together to discuss educational reform.

While State and local efforts are key to achieving the goals, there also is a significant Federal role, which historically has been limited but is critical. The Federal commitment to educational equity, accessibility to post-secondary opportunities and workforce training are central. There also is a federal role in providing research and development for assessment ef forts and for replicating successful programs.

STRATEGIES FOR ACHIEVING THE GOALS

The National Governors' Association, through its Task Force on Education, produced Educating America: State Strategies for Achieving the National Education Goals. It provided a broad framework and specific options to help guide states in their own planning to reach the goals.

The report described seven characteristics of a successful education system for the 1990's and the 21st century that bear repeating.

1. The system must be lifelong, recognizing that learning begins at birth, not at kindergarten, and continues throughout life.
2. The system must focus on prevention.
3. The system must be performance-oriented, geared to achieving results.
4. The system must be flexible. Professionals should make decisions how best to help a student achieve his or her highest potential.
5. The system and those who work in it must be accountable for the results they achieve.
6. The system must attract and retain talented professionals.
7. The system must provide meaningful choices to students, parents, and adult learners by recognizing and accommodating their varying learning needs and styles.

FLEXIBILITY

Through the NGA, the Governors have begun to examine Federal and State laws and regulations to identify barriers to developing comprehensive, effective programs. Suggestions for regulatory changes at the Federal level were made by states and forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget. NGA is continuing the process through an intensive case study of one State, Maryland, and a survey of all other States. Results and recommendations from the survey are expected in June.

RESTRUCTURING

There is near unanimity regarding the need to dramatically improve our education system. Indicators suggest that while the proportion of students that can perform low-level basic skills has risen, the percentage that can think critically, solve complex problems and communicate effectively is still very low.

The essential task before us is to reorient the system toward the achievement of specific, performance-based goals and objectives for all students. We need to move from a focus that mandates inputs to one that stresses outcomes. We need to create conditions where every child has an opportunity to achieve to the best of his or her ability. It is no longer enough to tinker with the existing educational system. Fundamental change to its structure and design are necessary.The good news is that we know what makes effective schools. We know the forces that contribute to and detract from student achievement. We know this from research and from the many examples of effective practice that exist throughout the nation. The challenge is to build upon this base of knowledge and practice to make comprehensive, systemic changes in the policies that affect all schools and all students.

The NGA will soon release a report on the status of State restructuring efforts. The report will highlight examples of State approaches to restructuring and suggest policies to further State initiatives. In addition, NGA will be working at the national, State and local levels to provide leadership and technical assistance as well as to build public support for restructuring and the national education goals. This will include coordination activities among major media, business, labor and parents' organizations.

I want to stress the role of business. The business community has joined the educational reform movement with a commitment of both resources and leadership. Organizations such as the Business Roundtable, the National Alliance of Business and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, among others, are willing partners in the efforts to make significant changes in our education system. The Business Roundtable has matched at least one CEO of a major corporation with the governor of each State to

help foster the business-education partnerships that are critical to restructuring in each State.

ACCOUNTABILITY

In July, the National Governors' Association adopted a policy establishing the National Education Goals Panel to oversee the development and implementation of a national education progress reporting system. Beginning in September, 1991, the panel will issue an annual report card to the Nation on our progress toward the national education goals. Copies of the text of the comprehensive national goals document and the NGA policy creating the panel are attached for your information.

I will devote the rest of my remarks to up-dating you on the activities of the panel.

THE PANEL'S WORK

In fulfilling this reporting responsibility, the panel sees its mission as two-fold. We must monitor and report progress toward the goals. But, more importantly, we must use the assessment and reporting process as a tool to help restructure the education system.

At its first meeting, the panel discussed and adopted the operating principles by which it will conduct its work. I share these with the Committee because I think they reflect the Panel's commitment and sense of purpose toward its task.

Bipartisanship. The panel is committed to fulfilling its responsibilities through a bipartisan approach.

Consensus. The Panel will make decisions through consensus, rather than through' formal votes.

Inclusion. The Panel will seek advice and counsel from educational and assessment experts and from education and business groups who will be responsible for implementing strategies to achieve the goals at the State and local level.

Building on Available Expertise. The panel will build on available expertise regarding assessment and educational reform issues at both the national and State levels. We will not reinvent the wheel.

Mobilization. Ultimately, what will motivate change in the present system is the understanding of individual parents, students, educators, business people and policymakers that achieving the national goals is important and that their actions can make a difference. The annual progress report should encourage the empowerment of individuals to act.

Accountability. Accountability for progress toward achieving the goals, on the part of States and the Federal Government, has been a key ingredient in the goals process from the beginning. The role of the panel is to try to make this measurement process meaningful, credible and a constructive force in reforming the education system.

National goals—Local Strategies. The panel will not dictate or prescribe strategies for achieving the goals. There is a strong tradition, based in both law and practice, for local emphasis in education decisions. Moreover, both the discussions at Charlottesville and the goals statement acknowledge the wisdom of decentralizing authority to the local school level. The panel sees its role as helping to articulate national standards for levels of achievement and then motivating, through measurement and other tools, State and local systems to implement effective strategies to enable all students to meet these standards.

Short-term and Long-Term Tracks. Much of the data that is needed for meaningful measurement of progress toward the goals is not currently available. The Panel is charged with proposing changes in national and international measurement and data collection systems to improve our capacity over the long-term. However, the panel also takes seriously its responsibility to issue a credible report in September, 1991, based on available data.

ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES

The panel will have staff located in Washington, DC that is independent from all of the institutionai entities represented on the panel. The staff will serve under the direction of and at the pleasure of the panel.

The panel has been interviewing candidates for the Executive Director and Deputy Director positions and intends to fill these positions by month's end. In addition, several policy analysts will be hired.

Since its creation, the panel has actively sought the advise and counsel of constituency groups and education experts about the work of the Panel. In addition to these informal contacts, 'the panel will conduct outreach activities in February-April, 1991, to solicit reaction and comment to a proposed format for the 1991 report. We will be targeting constituency based groups, education experts, and local policymakers.

At its last meeting, the panel charged five working groups to give advice and policy options to the panel about its work. A list of those working groups is attached to this testimony. In developing recommendations for the Panel's consideration, we asked the resource groups to:

1. Identify the key questions that the 50 States and the Federal Government should answer to provide the Nation with an accurate reading on where we currently standing with respect to the goal, including a way to determine the standards for where we should be, and the nature of our progress toward achieving the goal.
2. Identify the indicators that can be used by States and the Federal Government to provide data relevant to these key questions.
3. Make recommendations about how data sources and our assessment capacity can be improved over the long term.

The working groups will submit their recommendations in February 1991. These recommendations will serve as the basis for the panel's creation of a draft reporting instrument for the 1991 progress report. We will conduct substantial outreach activities to solicit reaction to this proposed format.

A FRAMEWORK FOR LONG-TERM RESPONSE

In my judgment, if the reporting process is to contribute to the achievement of the national education goals over the long term, the panel should provide leadership toward the achievement of the following objectives:

1. We must identify the specific indicators of accomplishment that will signal progress toward achievement of the goals.
2. We must identify and encourage the development of assessment strategies that permit us to know whether the goals are being met. We need this information both in terms of a national picture as well as on an individual basis.
3. We must provide the results of our assessments in a form and to the audiences that will provoke the systemic change necessary to fully achieve the goals.

I want to share briefly some of the discussion that the panel has begun to have about these issues. The panel has not adopted an official position to endorse these concept.

In these preliminary talks, the panel has agreed that the progress report requires student testing. There is emerging agreement that there are two kinds of tests, both of which have usefulness in this context: those that can help individuals understand their own levels of performance and those that, through a representative sample, can give a national perspective on performance.

Both tests should be measured against a set of national standards that articulate what' students at various grade levels should know and be able to do. These standards or achievement levels should be internationally comparable. While some kind of individual assessment is required, there is a desire not to adopt a single, national test. Instead, we are interested in encouraging States—which already expend significant resources on assessment—to work in collaboration with one another to develop and implement several examinations based on these common standards.

States, perhaps in association with private test publishers, would form several clusters to develop and implement these examinations. Then individual states would be free to chose among the various cluster approaches. A means would be identified for calibrating the different tests so that the results would be comparable.

I welcome the reaction and comments of this committee to this concept.

As chair of the National Education Goals Panel, it is my desire and intent to have a close working relationship with this committee throughout the coming year. I would welcome the opportunity to meet individually with any of you who are interested to discuss our mutual concerns and interests in more detail.

Thank you.

National Education Goals

INTRODUCTION

At the historic education summit in Charlottesville 5 months ago, the President the Governors declared that, "the time has come, for the first time in U.S. history, to establish clear, national performance goals, goals that vill make us internationally competitive." The six nationai education goals contained bore are the first step in carrying out that commitment.

America's educational performance must be second to none in the 21st century. Education is central to our quality of life. It is at the heart of our economic strength and security, our creativity in the arts and letters, our invention in the sciences, and the perpetuation of our cultural values. Education is the key to America's international competitiveness.

Today, a new standard for an educated citizenry is required, one suitable for the next century. Our people must be as knowledgeable, as well trained, as competent, and as inventive as those in any other nation. All of our people, not just a few, must be able to think for a living, adapt to changing environments, and to understand the world around them. They must understand and accept the responsibilities and obligations of citizenship. They must continually learn and develop nev skills throughout their lives.

America can meet this challenge if our society is dedicated to a renaissance in education. We must become a nation that values education and learning. We must recognize, that every child can learn, regardless of background or disability. We must recognize that education is a lifelong pursuit, not just an endeavor for our children.

Sweeping, fundamental changes in our education system must be made. Educators must be given greater flexibility to devise challenging and inspiring strategies to serve the needs of a diverse body of students. This is especially important for students vho are at risk of academic failur—for the failure of these students will become the failure of our nation. Achieving these changes depends in large part on the commitment of professional educators. Their daily work must be dedicated to creating a nev educational order in which success for all students is the first priority, and they must be held accountable for the results.

This is not the responsibility of educators alone, however. All Americans have an important stake in the success of our education system, and every part of our society must be involved in meeting that challenge. Parents must be more interested and involved in their children's education, and students must accept the challenge of higher expectations for achievement and greater responsibility for their future. In addition, communities, business and civic groups, and State, local, and Federal Government each has a vital role to play throughout this decade to ensure our success.

The first step is to establish ambitious national education goals—performance goals that must be achieved if the United States is to remain competitive in the world marketplace and our citizens are to reach their fullest potential. These goals are about excellence. Meeting them will require that the performance of our highest achievers be boosted to levels that equal or exceed the performance of the best students anywhere. The performance of our lowest achievers must be substantially increased far beyond their current performance. What our best students can achieve now, our average students must be able to achieve by the turn of the century. We must work to ensure that a significant number of students from all races, ethnic groups, and income levels are among our top performers.

If the United States is to maintain a strong and responsible democracy and a prosperous and groving economy into the next century, all of our citizens must be involved in achieving these goals. Every citizen will benefit as a result. When challenged, the American people have always shown their determination to succeed. The challenge before us calls on each American to help ensure our Nation's future.

NATIONAL GOALS FOR EDUCATION

Goal 1: By the year 2000, all children in America will start school ready to learn.

Objectives:

* All disadvantaged and disabled children will have access to high quality and developmentally appropriate preschool programs that help prepare children for school.
* Every parent in America will be a child's first teacher and devote time each day helping his or her preschool child learn: parents will have access to the training and support they need.

• Children will receive the nutrition and health care needed to arrive at school with healthy minds and bodies, and the number of low birthweight babies will be significantly reduced through enhanced prenatal health systems.

School Completion

Goal 2: By the year 2000, the high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent.

Objectives:

• The Nation must dramatically reduce its dropout rate and 75 percent of those students who do drop out will successfully complete a high school degree or its equivalent.

• The gap in high school graduation rates between American students from minority backgrounds and their non-minority counterparts will be eliminated.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND CITIZENSHIP

Goal 3: By the year 2000, American students will leave grades four, eight and twelve having demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, history, and geography, and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in our modern economy.

Objectives:

• The academic performance of elementary and secondary students will increase significantly in every quartile; and the distribution of minority students in each level will more closely reflect the student population as a whole.

• The percentage of students who demonstrate the ability to reason, solve problems, apply knowledge, and write and communicate effectively will increase substantially.

• All students will be involved in activities that promote and demonstrate good citizenship, community service, and personal responsibility.

• The percentage of students who are competent in more than one language will substantially increase.

• All students will be knowledgeable about the diverse cultural heritage of this Nation and about the world community.

MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE

Goal 4: By the year 2000, U.S. students will be first in the world in mathematics and science achievement.

Objectives:

• Math and science education will be strengthened throughout the system, especially in the early grades.

• The number of teachers with a substantive background in mathematics and science will increase by 50 percent.

• The number of U.S. undergraduate and graduate students, especially women and minorities, who complete degrees in mathematics, science, and engineering will increase significantly.

ADULT LITERACY AND LIFELONG LEARNING

Goal 5: By the year 2000, every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

Objectives:

• Every major American business will be involved in strengthening the connection between education and work.

• All workers will have the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills, from basic to highly technical, needed to adapt to emerging new technologies, work methods, and markets through public and private educational, vocational, technical, workplace, or other programs.

• The number of quality programs, including those at libraries, that are designed to serve more effectively the needs of the growing number of part-time and mid-career students will increase substantially

• The proportion of those qualified students, especially minorities, who enter college; who complete at least 2 years; and who complete their degree programs will increase substantially.

* The proportion of college graduates who demonstrate an advanced ability to think critically, communicate effectively, and solve problems will increase substantially.

SAFE, DISCIPLINED, AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS

Goal 6: By the year 2000, every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.

Objectives:

* Every school will implement a firm and fair policy on use, possession, and distribution of drugs and alcohol.
* Parents, businesses, and community organizations will work together to ensure that schools are a safe haven for all children.
* Every school district will develop a comprehensive K–12 drug and alcohol prevention education program. Drug and alcohol curriculum should be taught as an integral part of health education. In addition, community-based teams should be organized to provide students and teachers with needed support.

NECESSARY CHANGES AND RESTRUCTURING

These goals are ambitious, yet they can and must be achieved. However, they cannot be achieved by our education system as it is presently constituted. Substantial, even radical changes will have to be made.

Without a strong commitment and concertod effort on the part of every sector and every citizen to improve dramatically the performance of the Nation's education system and each and every student, these goals will remain nothing more than a distant, unattainable vision. For their part, Governors will work within their own States to develop strategies for restructuring their education systems in order to achieve the goals. Because States differ from one another, each State will approach this in a different manner. The President and the Governors will work to support these State efforts, and to recommend steps that the Federal Government, business, and community groups and educators should take to help achieve these national goals. The nature of many of these steps is already clear.

THE PRESCHOOL YEARS

American homes must be places of learning. Parents should play an active role in their childrens' early learning, particularly by reading to them on a daily basis. Parents should have access to the support and training required to fulfill this role, especially in poor, undereducated families.

In preparing young people to start school, both the Federal and State governments have important roles to play, especially with regard to health, nutrition, and early childhood development. Congress and the administration have increased maternal and child health coverage for all families with incomes up to 133 percent of the Federal poverty line. Many States go beyond this level of coverage, and more are moving in this direction. In addition, States continue to develop more effective delivery systems for prenatal and postnatal care. However, we still need more prevention, testing, and screening, and early identification and treatment of learning disorders and disabilities.

The Federal Government should work with the States to develop and fully fund early intervention strategies for children. All eligible children should have access to Head Start, Chapter I, or some other successful preschool program with strong parental involvement. Our first priority must be to provide at least one year of preschool for all disadvantaged children.

THE SCHOOL YEARS

As steps are taken to better prepare children for schools, we must also better prepare schools for children.

This is especially important for young children. Schools must be able to educate effectively all children when they arrive at the schoolhouse door, regardless of variations in students' interest, capacities, or learning styles.

Next, our public education system must be fundamentally restructured to ensure that all students can meet higher standards. This means reorienting schools so they focus on results, not on procedures; giving each school's principal and teachers the discretion to make more decisions and the flexibility to use Federal, State, and local

resources in more productive, innovative ways that improve learning; providing a way for gifted professionals who want to teach to do so through alternative certification avenues, and giving parents more responsibility for their children's education through magnet schools, public school choice, and other strategies. Most important, restructuring requires creating powerful incentives for performance and improvement, and real consequences for persistent failure. It is only by maintaining this balance of flexibility and accountability that we can truly improve our schools.

The Federal Government must sustain its vital role of promoting educational equity by ensuring access to quality educational programs for all students regardless of race, national origin, sex, or handicapping condition. Federal funds should target those students most in need of assistance due to economic disadvantage or risk of academic failure.

Finally, efforts to restructure education must work toward guaranteeing that all students are engaged in rigorous programs of instruction designed to ensure that every child, regardless of background or disability, acquires the knowledge and skills necessary to succeed in a changing economy. In recent years, there has been an increased commitment to math and science improvement programs. The Federal Government should continue to enhance financial assistance to State and local governments for effective programs in these areas. Likewise, there has been a greater Federal emphasis on programs that target youth at risk of school failure and dropping out. The Federal Government should continue to enhance funding and seek strategies to help States in their efforts to seek solutions to these problems.

Improving elementary and secondary student achievement will not require a national curriculum, but it will require that the Nation invest in developing the skills and knowledge of educators and equipping our schools with up-to-date technology. The quality of teachers and teaching is essential to meeting our goals. We must have well-prepared teachers and we must increase the number of qualified teachers in critical shortage areas, including rural and urban schools, specialized fields such as foreign languages, mathematics and science, and from minority groups. Policies must attract and keep able teachers who reflect the cultural diversity of our Nation. Policies that shape how educators are prepared, certified, rewarded, developed, and supported on the job must be consistent with efforts to restructure the education system and ensure that every school is capable of teaching all of our children to think and reason. Teachers and other school leaders must not only be outstanding, the schools in which they work must also be restructured to utilize both professional talent and technology to improve student learning and teacher- and system-productivity.

THE AFTER-SCHOOL YEARS

Comprehensive, well-integrated lifelong learning opportunities must be created for a world in which three of four new jobs will require more than a high school education; workers with only high school diplomas may face the prospect of declining incomes; and most workers will change their jobs ten or eleven times over their lifetime.

In most States, the present system for delivering adult literacy services is fractured and inadequate. Because the United States has far higher rates of adult functional illiteracy than other advanced countries, a first step is to establish in each State a public-private partnership to create a functionally literate workforce.

In some countries, government policies and programs are carefully coordinated with private sector activities to create effective apprenticeship and job training activities. By contrast, the United States has a multilayered system of vocational and technical schools, community colleges, and specific training programs funded from multiple sources and subject to little coordination. These institutions need to be restructured so they fit together more sensibly and effectively to give all adults access to flexible and comprehensive programs that meet their needs. Every major business must vork to provide appropriate training and educational opportunities to prepare employees for the twenty-first century.

Finally, a larger share of our population, especially those from working class, poor, and minority backgrounds, must be helped to attend and remain in college. The cost of a college education, as a percentage of median family income, has approximately tripled in a generation. That means more loans, scholarships, and workstudy opportunities are needed. The Federal Government's role in ensuring access for qualified students is critical. At the same time, the higher education system must use existing resources far more productively than it does at present, and must be held more accountable for what students do or do not learn. The Feder-

al Government will continue to examine ways to reduce students; increasing debt burden and to address the proper balance between grant and loan programs.

ASSESSMENT

National education goals will be meaningless unless progress toward meeting them is measured accurately and adequately, and reported to the American people. Doing a good job of assessment and reporting requires the resolution of three issues.

First, what students need to know must be defined. In some cases, there is a solid foundation on which to build. For example, the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics and the Mathematical Sciences Education Board have done important work in defining what all students must know and be able to do in order to be mathematically competent. A major effort for science has been initiated by the American Association for the Advancement of Science. These efforts must be expanded and extended to other subject areas.

Second, when it is clear what students need to know, it must be determined whether they know it. There have been a number of important efforts to improve our ability to measure student learning at the State and national levels. This year for the first time, the National Assessment for Education Progress (NAEP) will collect data on student performance on a State-by-State basis for 37 States. Work is underway to develop a national assessment of adult literacy. These and other efforts must be supported and strengthened.

The Governors urge the National Assessment Governing Board to begin work to set national performance goals in the subject areas in which NAEP will be administered. This does not mean establishing standards for individual competence; rather, it requires determining how to set targets for increases in the percentage of students performing at the higher levels of the NAEP scales.

Third, measurements must be accurate, comparable, appropriate, and constructive. Placement decisions for young children should not be made on the basis of standardized tests. Achievement tests must not simply measure minimum competencies, but also higher levels of reading, writing, speaking, reasoning, and problem-solving skills. And in comparing America's achievement with that of other countries, it is essential that international comparisons are reliable. In addition, appropriate, nationally directed research, demonstration projects, data collection, and innovation should be maintained and recognized as a set of core responsibilities of the Federal Government in education. That role needs to be strengthened in cooperation with the States.

The President and the Governors agree that while we do not need a new data-gathering agency, we do need a bipartisan group to oversee the process of determining and developing appropriate measurements and reporting on the progress toward meeting the goals. This process should stay in existence until at least the year 2000 so that we assure 10 full years of effort toward meeting the goals.

A CHALLENGE

These national education goals are not the President's goals or the Governors' goals; they are the nation's goals.

These education goals are the beginning, not the end, of the process. Governors are committed to working within their own States to review State education goals and performance levels in light of these national goals. States are encouraged to adjust State goals according to this review, and to expand upon national goals where appropriate. The President and the Governors challenge every family, school, school district, and community to adopt these national goals as their own, and establish other goals that reflect the particular circumstances and challenges they face as America approaches the twenty-first century.

NGA Policy—Approved by the Members of the National Governors' Association on July 29, 1990.

A PROCESS FOR MEASURING AND REPORTING ON PROGRESS TOWARD THE NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS

At the historic Education Summit, the President and the Nation's Governors, as elected chief executives made a commitment to be held accountable for progress in achieving the national education goals. To fulfill this commitment, this statement establishes the process for identifying measures of performance and reporting on

41-189 - 91 - 2

progress toward the goals, and reaffirms the decade-long partnership toward realizing the goals.

In order to provide the direction and support needed to instill public confidence and the full cooperation of Federal and State officials, the President and Governors agree to establish the National Education Goals Panel to oversee the development and implementation of a national education progress reporting systen. The process for developing and establishing appropriate measures and reporting annually on progress will build on the constructive, bipartisan partnership between the President and the Governors initiated at the Charlottesville Summit.

NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL

The National Education Goals Panel will be composed of:

* Four senior-level Federal executive branch officials appointed by the President;
* Six Governors appointed by the Chairman of the National Governors' Association in consultation with the Vice-Chairman, with no more than three of the Governors being from the same party; and
* Four congressional leaders (Senate Majority and Minority Leaders, the Speaker of the House or his designee and House Minority Leader) invited to serve as ex-officio non-voting members.

The Chairman of the panel will be appointed annually by the Chairman of the National Governors' Association.

The executive branch officials will serve at the pleasure of the President. Governors will be appointed to the Panel for a 2-year term, except that two of the initial appointments, equally divided between the two parties, shall be for a 3-year term.

The panel will be responsible for determining the indicators used to measure the national education goals and for reporting progress toward their achievement. Its responsibilities shall include:

* Selecting interim and final measures and appropriate measurement tools to be developed as necessary in each goal area;
* Determining baselines and benchmarks against which progress may be evaluated;
* Determining the format for an annual report to the Nation; and
* Reporting on the Federal Government's action to fulfill those responsibilities set forth in the Federal-State partnership at Charlottesville, including funding the Federal financial role, providing more flexibility in spending under existing Federal programs, and controlling mandates that limit the States' ability to fund education, as defined in the joint statement issued at the Charlottesville Summit.

In addition, the Panel will review proposed changes in national and international measurement systems as appropriate and make recommendations to the President, the Congress, and the Governors for needed improvements.

The panel will not be limited by availability of current data and measurements in its decisions as it designs the format of the report card. It will seek to identify fair, constructive measures that will boost the performance of students at all levels.

The panel shall have the authority to hire and direct an independent staff to assist it with its responsibilities.

In making final decisions, the panel will operate on the principle of consensus among the Governors, Executive Branch, and Congress. In the event that a vote must be taken, a decision will require 75 percent of the voting members.

EXPERT ADVISERS

The process for developing and establishing appropriate measures shall benefit from the experiences and expertise of the education research and measurement communities and other interested parties.

The panel, in carrying out its responsibilities, will consult broadly with experts in the field of research and measurement, as well as with other interested parties, in order to:

* Identify and evaluate existing indicators; and
* Prepare specific options and recommendations for the panel concerning: the selection of appropriate indicators; baselines and benchmarks against which performance may be evaluated; and the format for an annual report.

Report To The Nation

The President and the Governors agree that beginning in 1991, the panel will issue a report card to the Nation on the anniversary of the Education Summit (September 27–28) on progress toward the national education goals. The Governors reaffirm their commitment made in Charlottesville to report individually on restructuring efforts in their States on the first anniversary of the Education Summit.

In developing the report card, the panel will be guided by the following principles:

* The measurements and benchmarks should be consistent with the intent of the Charlottesville Joint Statement and the comprehensive statement of national education goals adopted by the President and the Governors.

* The measurement of benchmarks should not discriminate in favor of or against any State based on its current performance or the degree of improvement needed to reach the goals. The main focus of the national report card will be measuring each State's progress toward achieving the goals based on each State's baseline.

Following the release of the annual report card, each Governor shall issue a report on progress in his or her State related to the goals.

EXTENDING THE PARTNERSHIP

Although the immediate task relates to national, State, and international assessments, the President and the Governors encourage the creation of similar systems of accountability in every school in America.

The President and Governors agree to begin work immediately to fulfill the commitments made in this statement.

RESOURCE GROUPS

RESOURCE GROUP ON SCHOOL READINESS
Ernest Boyer, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (convener)
James Comer, Child Studies Center, Yale University
Sam Meisels, Center for Human Growth and Development, University of Michigan
Lucille Newman, School of Medicine, Brown University
Doug Powell, Department of Child Development & Family Studies, Purdue University
James Wilsford, Orangeburg School District No. 5, Orangeburg,SC
Nick Zill, Child Trends, Inc.
RESOURCE GROUP ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT
Lauren Resnick, Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh (convener)
Gordon Ambach, Council of Chief State School Officers
Chester Finn Jr., Educational Excellence Network, Vanderbilt

NIVERSITY

Asa Hilliard, College of Education, Georgia State University
David Hornbeck, Consultant
Richard Mills, Vermont State Department of Education
Tom Payzant, San Diego Public Schools
Claire Pelton, San Jose Unified School District, California
Terry K. Peterson, Business-Education Subcommittee of the South Carolina Education Improvement Act
Marshall Smith, School of Education, Stanford University
RESOURCE GROUP ON MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE ACHIEVEMENT
Alvin Trivelpiece, Oak Ridge National Laboratory (convener)
Iris Carl, Houston Independent School District
Linda Darling-Hammond, Teachers' College, Columbia University
Edward Haertel, School of Education, Stanford University
Ken Lay, IBM Mike Nettles, University of Tennessee
Senta Raizen, National Center for Improving Science Education
Ramsay Selden, Council of Chief State School Officers
RESOURCE GROUP ON LITERACY AND LIFELONG LEARNING
Mark Musick, Southern Regional Education Board (convener)
Paul Barton, Education Testing Service
Forrest Chisman, Southport Institute
Peter Ewell, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems

Patsy Fulton, Brookhaven College
James R. Morris Jr., South Carolina State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education
William Spring, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston
Tom Sticht, Applied Behavioral and Cognitive Sciences
Marc Tucker, National Center for Education and Economy
RESOURCE GROUP ON SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS
Joseph Fernandez, New York City Public Schools (convener)
Constance Clayton, Philadelphia Public Schools
Delbert Elliott, Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado
David Hawkins, social Development Research Group, University of Washington
Lloyd Johnston, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Clayton?

Ms. CLAYTON. Thank you very much. As you have indicated, Mr. Chairman, my name is Constance Clayton. I am superintendent of the sixth largest public school district in the United States. I am really quite pleased to appear before your committee this morning on behalf of my city as president-elect of the Council of the Great City Schools and as a member of the Council's National Urban Education Task Force.

I thank you for the invitation to speak before this crucial committee concerning your agenda and priorities for the 102nd Congress. Before I begin, I would like to call your attention to a publication presented by the Council last fall, "Results 2000: Progress in Meeting Urban Education Goals." It describes some of the headway urban schools are making toward the national goals but concludes that our current upward trajectory is insufficient to attain them by the year 2000 without additional help.

Mr. Chairman, when the President and the Governors met over a year ago to establish national education goals, many of us on the front lines were cautiously optimistic that a new political will had emerged that would catapult our schools into a position of preeminence. That optimism has now largely been tainted by skepticism and undermined by some inactivity.

The President submitted an education proposal to Congress last year that was far too small and piecemeal. The goals were written with precious little involvement of those who actually work in schools. The strategies that were developed were not well informed by local experience. And the wherewithal to attain the goals has not materialized. We applaud the Governors for raising the public's consciousness about education, but we have been left empty-handed since. Policies uninformed by practice and unsupported with funding convey only cynicism to those who must carry them out.

Valuable time has been lost since the national goals were set, time that urban schools—and poor rural ones, particularly in the South—cannot squander, for we are the very institutions around which much of the reform debate is focused, and the ones within which the consequences of the recession are already being deeply felt. The Nation has no hope of realizing the President's vision without special attention to these districts.

The litany of urban school ailments is familiar; low student achievement, illiteracy, dropouts, homelessness; discipline problems, teen pregnancy, substance abuse, and violence fester in the inner cities. Deteriorating school buildings, lack of adequate teaching materials, dwindling financial resources, and shortages of qualified and committed teachers, principals and support staff fur-

ther complicate the unstable conditions of urban schools and communities. Furthermore, these burdens are borne in disproportionate numbers by the children of African-American and Hispanic parents, those with limited English proficiency, and those who live within poverty-stricken inner cores of America's major cities. Those problems have not been exaggerated, Mr. Chairman, and I respectfully call you attention to the statistics on page 5 of my testimony.

The question may be asked, however, by those outside the cities: "Why should I care?" The reasons are uncomplicated. First, America's economic and global primacy depends on the productivity of the children now being educated in our city schools, the next generation of workers. Consider the following fact, please: If the graduation rate for urban schools equaled the national average, the Nation's major city schools would have graduated more than 325,000 students in 1988, instead of just over 239,000. At the current 28 percent tax rate, the Federal tax on the additional lifetime earnings of those extra 86,000-plus individuals, had they stayed in school, is large enough to double the present congressional appropriation for elementary and secondary education, increase Federal AIDS research five-fold, or boost drug prevention efforts by a factor of 10—efforts that benefit the whole Nation, not just the cities.

Second, unless action is taken immediately, the problems facing the big city schools will become prevalent in the other schools in this Nation. Finally, the country has a moral imperative, grounded in our Constitution, to strive for individual justice, equality and excellence for all its citizens. Education is the only public strategy designed to endow those rights on all of our young people.

In short, our city schools are the fundamental test of our national vision—a commitment to social democracy for all. This is a vision that has been much blurred of recent. The Nation's inattention to the needs and promise of urban youth is a spiritual failure of the first magnitude and a catastrophic strategic mistake that saps our national strength. Such a strategic error will be compounded unless those of us who are educators and policy makers on the front lines act affirmatively. Urban school systems, therefore, have mobilized to formulate national goals derived from the President's work which reflect the specific needs of those who must implement them. We have involved over 70 different organizations in that process, and those goals are listed in my testimony for your review.

Each goal is accompanied by a specific set of objectives and statistical indicators for measuring progress toward them, and that is part of the appendix. Moreover, we have compiled a compendium of the most promising, well-tested strategies for reaching those goals—strategies based on research and practical experience in urban settings. Finally, we are convening this weekend a National Urban Education Summit Conference—chaired by Joseph Fernandez, Chancellor of the New York City Public Schools—of national education, child advocacy, civil rights, city and State and Federal officials to commit to a unified 10-year struggle toward those goals.

Mr. Chairman, the urban schools of this Nation are trying to fill in the substantial gaps left in the wake of the initial goal-setting process and to move both the focus and the energy of the debate to the local level, where it should be.

We have committed ourselves specifically to a set of demanding urban goals by the year 2000. We have said how we are going to get there; we have said how we will measure our progress; and we have involved an unprecedented range of groups—acknowledging that we cannot get there alone.

And we really cannot. The challenges faced by the Nation's urban schools are simply too entrenched, complex, entangled, and costly for a single agency or institution to solve. We need the assistance and the collaboration of everyone who can help, including the Federal Government.

We are, then, urging this committee, this Congress, this administration, to join us in devising a "Marshall Plan" for urban schools. Mr. Chairman, in setting your elementary and secondary education agenda for the 102nd Congress, we would urge you to forego the passage of small, categorical demonstration programs, but instead to take the time and the energy to devise the kind of comprehensive, collaborative legislation that the cities so badly need.

We recommend for your consideration the Urban Schools of America (USA) Act that you and former Chairman Augustus Hawkins introduced at the end of the last session. The attractive and necessary features of that bill include:

A comprehensive program based on achieving the national goals rather than on specific categories of children;

Flexibility to design local programs that could best meet the national goals;

An unprecedented accountability provision that would cut off "USA" funds if a school did not make progress toward the goals according to pre-set criteria;

Incentive grants to schools that make unusually high progress toward the goals;

Sufficient size and scale to make a real difference;

The possibility of waiving certain regulations that might impede student progress;

Collaboration with a wide variety of community-based, parent and private sector organizations;

Resources to repair and renovate our dilapidated school buildings; and

Funds for evaluating and assessing progress on the goals.

Why this bill and why now? First, the legislation is designed to dovetail with one of the Nation's most important new educational demands—the need to move critical decisions down to those closest to the children. The cities are now pioneering ways to do that, sometimes at great risk. Chicago has moved toward fully decentralized, parent/community run schools. New York is deeply engaged in school-based management/shared decision-making, as Miami has been for over a decade. And Philadelphia is engaged in a relentless effort of restructuring schools' strategies of governance, instructional programs, assessment, and relations with local communities, parents, employers and universities. The "USA" bill spurs these initiatives and helps meet the demand to restructure by providing us the greatest flexibility to get the job done.

Second, the legislation is designed to address the growing insistence for accountability, for results. The Nation's parents, taxpayers, and business community are correct in demanding a return on

their investment. The "USA" bill speaks to this demand by stating that the funds should be cut off if progress is not evident. No other piece of Federal legislation has gone so far.

Third, the "USA" bill adopts one of the good ideas from President Bush's education package by rewarding success. If a low-achieving school makes unusual progress toward the goals, then it is given extra resources. And it is done in a way that schools are not simply vying for prizes.

Fourth, the bill is large enough and targeted enough to make a difference. It sends money only to the Nation's hardest pressed inner-city school systems, and within those systems to the lowest achieving and poorest schools to conduct school-wide improvement efforts. Furthermore, it fills the enormous gap between what the states are able to fund and what our needs are. And I call your attention to the table on page 11. It therefore is cost-efficient at a time when the Federal Government is concerned about its deficit by preserves the historic Federal role of serving those most in need. And while we are concerned about the red ink, we would respectfully remind the committee that the Federal contribution to schools has dropped 40 percent since 1980.

Finally, the "USA" bill offers comprehensive and fundamental assistance. It seeks to involve the entire urban community in assisting its children—parents, colleges and universities, business, labor, government, community-based groups and other agencies. That is what Hameen talked about today in terms of our Comprehensive Student Support Service Program. And it does so in a way that significantly broadens the positive Federal strategy currently in use of targeting aid solely on the demographic characteristics of students. The "USA" bill builds on that approach by tying all of those efforts and their supporters together in a grand plan for our schools' improvement.

Mr. Chairman, the urban schools of this Nation ask you, we ask this Congress, to join with us—to renew our historic vows on behalf of the neediest among us—and move together to reinvest in the children, my children, your children, our children.

This initiative reaffirms Emma Lazarus' welcome engraved at the base of the Statue of Liberty: "Give us your hungry, your tired, your poor." It does not offer platitudes based on "choice" rhetoric or fall in the 1980's selfish indifference to the homeless, the poor, or the oppressed.

If we can bail out our savings and loans, we can lift up our children. If we can build more prisons, we can keep our schools from looking like prisons.

The CHAIRMAN. We will give you about another minute or two.

Ms. CLAYTON. All right. If we can fashion the weapons of war, we can mastermind the tools for learning.

I close by saying that we ask no less of you than we ask of ourselves, our teachers and our parents and our students. We ask you to help us help the children who need us desperately and who want most painfully to be a part of this American dream, but who unfortunately are beginning to believe that it is beyond their reach.

With that, sir, I do conclude and will graciously accept any questions from the committee.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Clayton follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF CONSTANCE CLAYTON, SUPERINTENDENT OF PHILADELPHIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. Chairman, my name is Constance Clayton. I am the superintendent of the Philadelphia Public Schools, the Nation's sixth largest public school system. I am pleased to appear before you this morning on behalf of my city, as president-elect of the Council of the Great City Schools, and as a member of the National Urban Education Task Force.

Currently in its 35th year, the Council of the Great City Schools is a national organization comprised of 47 of the Nation's largest urban public school systems. Our Board of Directors is comprised of the Superintendent and one Board of Education member from each city, making the Council the only education group so constituted and the only one whose membership and purpose is solely urban.

The Council's membership serves over 5 million inner-city youngsters or about 12.7 percent of the Nation's public school enrollment. Approximately 40 percent of the Nation's African-American children, 30 percent of its Hispanic children and 25 percent of the Nation's Asian-American children are being educated in our schools.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the invitation to speak before this crucial committee concerning your agenda and priorities for the 102nd Congress. Before I begin, I would like to call your attention to a report that the Council published last Fall, Results 2000: Progress in Meeting Urban Education Goals. It describes the headway urban schools are making toward the national goals but concludes that our current upward trajectory is insufficient to attain them by the year 2000 without additional help.

Mr. Chairman, when the President and the Governors met over a year ago to establish national education goals, many of us on the front lines were cautiously optimistic that a new political will had emerged that would catapult our schools into a position of preeminence. That optimism has now largely been tainted by skepticism and undermined by inactivity.

The President submitted an education proposal to the Congress last year that was far too small and piecemeal. The goals were written with precious little involvement of those who actually work in schools. The strategies that were developed were not well-informed by local experience. And, the where-with-all to attain the goals has not materialized. We applaud the Governors for raising the public's consciousness about education, but we have been left empty-handed since. Policies uninformed by practice and unsupported with tunding convey only cynicism to those who must carry them out.

Valuable time has been lost since the National Goals were set, time that urban schools—and poor rural ones, particularly in the South—cannot squander, for we are the very institutions around which much of the reform debate is focused, and the ones within which the consequences of the recession are already being deeply felt. The Nation has no hope of realizing the President's vision without special attention to these districts.

The litany of urban school ailments is familiar: low student achievement; illiteracy; dropouts; homelessness; discipline problems; teen pregnancy; substance abuse; and violence fester in the inner cities. Deteriorating school buildings, lack of adequate teaching materials, dwindling financial resources, and shortages of qualified and committed teachers, principals and support staff turther complicate the unstable conditions of urban schools and communities. Furthermore, these burdens are borne in disproportionate numbers by the children of African-American and Hispanic parents, those with limited-English-proficiency, and those who live within poverty stricken inner cores of America's major cities. Those problems have not been exaggerated. (Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to the statistics in my prepared statement.)

The question may be asked, however, by those outside the cities: "Why should I care?" The reasons are uncomplicated. First, America's economic and global primary depends on the productiviry of the children now being educated in our city schools, the next generation of workers. Consider the following fact: if the graduation rate for urban schools equaled the national average, the Nation's major city schools would have graduated 325,520 students in 1988 instead of 239,317. At the current 28 percent tax rate, the Federal tax on the additional lifetime earnings of those extra 86,203 individuals—had they stayed in school—is large enough to double the present Congressional appropriation for elementary and secondary education, increase Federal AIDS research five-fold, or boost drug prevention efforts by a factor of ten—efforts that benefit the whole Nation, not just the cities.

SELECTED STATISTICS ON URBAN SCHOOLS

—shortages of teachers for urban schools are 2.5 times greater than the other lcinds of schools systems;

—75.0 percent of urban school buildings are over 25 years old; 33 percent are over 50 years old, the repair and renovation of which would require $5 billion

—72.3 percent of urban school children are African-American, Hispanic or Asian-American

—57.4 percent of urban school children are eligible for iree or reduced price lunch subsidies

—12.4 percent of urban school children are limited-English proficient

—10.9 percent of urban school children are handicapped or disabled

—the median urban school system SAT. composite score is 862 (national average is 904)

—urban preschool children have 50 percent the access to early childhood development programs as do their suburban counterparts

—the urban school dropout rate is 67.6 percent higher than either suburban or rural schools

—urban schools teach in approximately 115 languages

Second, unless action is taken immediately, the problems facing the big city schools will become prevalent in all the Nation's schools. Finally, the country has a moral imperative, grounded in the Constitution, to strive for individual justice, equality and excellence for all its citizens. Education is the only public strategy designed to endow those rights on all our young people.

In short, our city schools are the fundamental test of our national vision—a comnntment to social democracy for all. This is a vision that has been much blurred of recent. The Nation's inattention to the needs and promise of urban youth is a spiritual failure of the first magnitude and a catastrophic strategic mistake that saps our national strength. Such a strategic error will be compounded unless those of us who are educators and policy makers the front lines act affirmatively. Urban school systems, therefore, have mobilized to formulate national goals derived from the President's work which reflect the specific needs of those who must implement them. We have involved over seventy different organizations in the process. Those goals are as follows:

NATIONAL URBAN EDUCATION GOALS

1. By the year 2000, schools and communities will demonstrate high expectations for all learners so that urban students will attain a level of achievement that will allow them to compete successfully with students nationally and internationally.

2. By the year 2000, all urban school children will start school ready to learn.

3. By the year 2000, urban schools will intiease their graduation rates so they are at least comparable to the national average.

4. By the year 2000, urban school graduates will be fully prepared to enter and successfully complete higher education, experience successful employment, and exercise their responsibilities as citizens.

5. By the year 2000, urban schools will be adequately staffed with qualified teachers who are culturally and racially sensitive and who reflect the racial characteristics of their students.

6. By the year 2000, urban schools will be free of drugs and alcohol, students will be well-nourished and healthy, and schools will be well-maintained and safe.

Each goal is accompanied by a specific set of objectives and statistical indicators for measuring progress toward them (see appendix). Moreover, we have compiled a compendium of the most promising, well-tested strategies for reaching those goals—strategies based on research and practical experience in urban settings. Finally, we are convening this weekend a National Urban Education Summit Conference; chaired by Joseph Fernandez, chancellor of the New York City Public Schools; of national education, child advocacy, civil rights, city and State officials to commit to a unified 10-year struggle toward the goals.

Mr. Chairman, the urban schools of this Nation are trying to fill in the substantial gaps left in the wake of the initial goal-setting process and to move both the focus and energy of the debate to the local level, where it should be.

We have committed ourselves specifically to a set of demanding urban goals by the year 2000; we have said how we are going to get there; we have said how we will measure our progress; and we have involved an unprecedented range of groups—acknowledging that we can not get there alone.

And we cannot. The challenges faced by the Nation's urban schools are simply too entrenched, complex, entangled and costly for a single agency or institution to solve. We need the assistance and collaboration of everyone who can help, including the federal government.

We are, then, urging this committee, this Congress, this administration to join us in devising a "Marshall Plan" for urban schools. Mr. Chairman, in setting your elementary and secondary education agenda for the 102nd Congress, we would urge you to forego the passage of small, categorical, demonstration programs; but instead to take the time and energy to devise the kind of comprehensive, collaborative legislation that the cities so badly need.

We recommend for your consideration the "Urban Schools of America (USA)" Act that you and former Chairman Augustus Hawkins introduced at the end of the last session. The attractive and necessary features of that bill include:

—A comprehensive program based on achieving the national goals rather than on specific categories of children;

—Flexibility to design local programs that could best meet the national goals;

— An unprecedented accountability provision that would cut off "USA", funds if a school did not make progress tord the goals according to pre-set criteria;

—Incentive grants to schools that make unusually high progress toward the goals;

—Sufficient size and scale to make a real difference;

—The possibility of waiving certain regulations that might impede student achievement;

—Collaboration with a wide variety of community-based, parent and private-sector organizations;

—Resources to repair and renovate our dilapidated school buildings; and

—Funds for evaluating and assessing progress on the goals.

Why this bill and why now? First, the legislation is designed to dovetail with one of the nation's most important new educational demands— the need to move critical decisions down to those closest to the children. The cities are now pioneering ways to do that, sometimes at great risk. Chicago has moved toward fully decentralized, parent/community run schools. New York is deeply engaged in school-based management/shared decision making, as Miami Dade has been for over a decade. And Philadelphia is engaged in a relentless effort of restructuring schools' strategies of governance, instructional programs, assessment, and relations with local communities, parents, employers and universities. The "U.S.A" bill spurs these initiatives, and helps meet the demand to restructure by providing us the greatest flexibility to get the job done.

Second, the legislation is designed to address the growing insistence for accountability, for results. The Nation's parents, taxpayers, and business community are correct in demanding a return on their investment. The "U.S.A" bill speaks to this demand by stating that the funds should be cut off if progress is not evident. No other piece of Federal legislation has gone so far.

Third, the "U.S.A" bill adopts one of the good ideas from President Bush's education package by rewarding success. If a low-achieving school makes unusual progress towards the goals, then it is given extra resources. And it is done in a way that schools are not simply vying for prizes.

Fourth, the bill is large enough and targeted enough to make a difference. It sends money only to the Nation's hardest pressed inner-city school systems—and within those systems, to the lowest achieving and poorest schools to conduct school-wide improvement efforts. Furthermore, it helps fill the enormous gap between what the States are able to fund and what our needs are. (See table on page 11.) It, therefore, is cost-efficient at a time when the Federal Government is concerned about its deficit but preserves the historic Federal role of serving those most in need. And while we are concerned about the red ink, we would remind the committee respy that the Federal contribution to schools has dropped 40 percent since 1980.

Finally, the "U.S.A." bill offers comprehensive and fundamental assistance. It seeks to involve the entire urban community in assisting its children—parents, colleges and universities, business, labor, government, community-based groups and other agencies. And it does so in a way that significantly broadens the positive Federal strategy currently in use of targeting aid solely on the demographic characteristics of students. the "U.S.A." builds on that approach by tying all these efforts and their supporters together in a grand plan for our schools' improvement.

Urban School Share of State Wide Total

City	El./Sec. Expenditures	Poverty Enrollment percent [1]	Total Enrollment percent
Anchorage	30.4	40.0	—
Atlanta	6.3	12.6	5.8
Baltimore	12.7	47.4	16.2
Baton Rouge	6.9	4.6	7.3
Boston	5.5	18.8	7.3
Buffalo	2.4	3.1	1.8
Chicago	28.0	54.4	23.2
Cincinnati	3.3	6.6	2.9
Cleveland	6.7	12.3	4.1
Columbus	3.9	7.2	3.7
Dade County	17.3	16.8	15.3
Dallas	1.7	6.1	3.9
Dayton	2.2	3.9	1.7
Denver	4.6	22.9	10.7
Detroit	18.2	31.8	11.1
Jacksonville	6.4	6.3	—
El Paso	2.1	5.4	1.7
Fresno	1.3	1.4	1.4
Houston	4.0	9.4	5.9
Indianapolis	5.8	16.3	5.2
Long Beach	1.6	1.8	1.5
Los Angeles	16.0	18.2	13.2
Memphis	10.8	22.2	12.9
Milwaukee	17.6	26.4	12.4
Minneapolis	5.0	10.1	5.5
Nashville	6.3	7.1	7.9
New Orleans	9.3	19.7	10.5
New York	33.5	62.6	36.4
Norfolk	4.9	8.1	3.7
Oakland	2.4	2.4	1.1
Omaha	13.8	23.1	15.4
Philadelphia	14.3	30.5	12.0
Phoenix [2]	1.1	(23.3)	3.5
Pitttburg	2.3	4.9	2.4
Portland	8.9	14.5	11.6
Rochester	1.5	1.8	1.2
St. Louis	11.4	20.1	5.7
St. Paul	4.8	7.6	4.5
San Diego	1.9	3.6	2.6
San Francisco	1.4	2.4	1.4
Seattle	6.1	11.2	5.3
Toledo	3.0	4.5	2.4
Tucson	9.6	10.6	9.9
Tulsa	5.1	9.0	7.3
Washington	100.0	100.0	100.0
Average	17.7	30.4	16.3

[1] 1980 Census Data

[2] Includes percentage of school-age children in poverty for entire City of Phoenix; other statistics are for the Phoenix Union High school district

Mr. Chairman, the urban schools of this Nation ask you, the Congress, to join with us—to renew our historic vows on behalf of the neediest amongst us—and move together to reinvest in the children, my children, your children, our children.

This initiative reaffirms Emma Lazarus' welcome engraved at the base of the Statue of Liberty to "Give us your hungry, your tired and your poor". It does not offer platitudes based on "choice" rhetoric or fall into the 1980's selfish indifference to the homeless, the poor, or the oppressed.

If we can bail out our savings and loans, we can lift up our children. If we can build more prisons, we can keep our schools from looking like them. If we can fashion the weapons of war, we can mastermind the tools for learning.

We are asking, then, through the "U.S.A" bill, for a broadened strategy and an enhanced investment in improving schools where improvement is most necessary—in our inner-cities. We are asking that Congress seize the initiative in moving us toward our national goals.

The "U.S.A" bill urges that you build on the current Federal strategy not through band-aids but through comprehensive services. It discourages systems that are self-protective and encourages collaboration. It asks for money but demands results. And it does so through an image of educational democracy that is unprecedented.

We ask no less of you than we ask of ourselves, our teachers, our parents, and our students. Help us help the children who need us most desperately, and who want, most painfully, to be part of the American dream, but who believe that it is well beyond their reach.

I leave you with a lesson from Ronald, an 11th grader, who lives in my city in subsidized housing. A researcher asked Ronald, "So, why do you stay in high school, when so many others from your neighborhood have already dropped out?" Ronaid replied, "Everyday, when I walk to school, I see this bum at the subway, and I think, 'Not me.' But then I worry. Maybe he has a high school diploma, and he's still sleeping in the subway. That's when I get really depressed." Let's prove Ronald wrong.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my testimony and I would be happy to answer questions.

APPENDIX

GOAL 1

By the year 2000 schools and communities will demonstrate high expectations for all learners so that urban students will attain a level of achievement that will allow them to successfully compete with students nationally and internationally in our global community.

Objectives:

—To close the gap in academic achievement between urban and suburban schools.

—To continue to close gaps in academic achievement among urban students of all racial, ethnic, cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds.

—To improve the distribution of student test scores across all four quartiles.

—To increase the numbers of students who take the SAT or ACT and to boost the average system-wide scores annually.

—To demonstrate achievement scores that equal or exceed norms on nationally standardized tests.

—To increase the enrollment of urban students in advanced courses rn math and science and other preparatory courses.

—To increase enrollment of urban students in core curriculum subjects.

GOAL 2

By the year 2000, all urban children start school ready to learn.

Objectives:

—To provide access for needy urban children aged 35 to a full-day, full year development program, offering a full range of health, nutrition, developmental, educational, social, language, and other services.

—To ensure that urban pre-K programs will be adequately staffed with qualified personnel and necessary equipment.

—To make available comprehensive child care services to the children of students, and before and after school care for those in need.

—To provide urban parents with the opponity to receive training in parenting skills at school sites.

—To coordinate affordable Preschool services throughout the community to ensure mmum benefits.

GOAL 3

By the year 2000, urban schools will increase theire graduation rates so they are at least comparable to the national average.

Objectives:

—To reduce the gap in graduation rates between urban and non-urban youth, among students of various racial disability, language and ethnic backgrounds, and among students of vng economic circumstance.

—To reduce urban dropouts by 50 percent by the year 2000, and by another 50 percent by 2010.

—To increase urban four-year graduation rates annually between 1991 and 2000.

—To increase daily urban student attendance rates to 95 percent for elementary schools and 90 percent for secondary schools.

—To increase the number of urban dropouts who return to school. To reduce urban school rates of in-grade retention by 10 percent annually.

GOAL 4

By the year 2000, urban school graduates will be fully prepared to enter and successfully complete higher education, experience successful employment, and exercise their responsibilities as citizens.

Objectives:

—To increase the numbers of urban school graduates who enroll in four-year college or university degree programs.

—To upgrade and improve the quality of urban vocational education and job training programs.

—To increase substantially the number of eligible urban school students registered to vote.

—To increase opportunities for urban school students to participate in community service programs and activities in the schools and the community.

—To increase the ability o urban school graduates to reason, think critically, solve pro Iems, and make decisions.

GOAL 5

By the year 2000, urban schools be adequately staffed with qualified teachers who are culturally and racially sensitive and who reflect the racial characteristics of their students.

Objectives:

—To increase the percentage of African American, Hispanic American, Asian and Pacific Islander Americans, American Indians, and Alaska Native teachers in urban classrooms.

—To ensure that urban teachers are adequately trained in the history, culture and learning styles of students in city schools, using curricula that is multicultural and gender fair.

—To increase the overall number of urban teachers and the number of special area teachers.

GOAL 6

By the year 2000, urban schools be free of drugs andalcohol, students will be well nourished and healthy, and schools will be well-maintained and safe.

Objectives:

—To substantially reduce drug and alcohol use, possession and distribution among urban school students and staff.

—To expand Drug-Free Zones around schools each year.

—To provide adequate nutrition each day and necessary instruction in nutrition education.

—To ensure that urban school students are healthy and in good physical condition.

—To substantially cut teen pregnancy among urban school students.

—To develop in urban school students adequate self-confidence, self-esteem, and personal decision-making skills.

—To provide urban children and staff with school buildings that are in good repair, clean, well-maintained, barrier-free and: environmentally safe.

—To ensure that urban students feel safe in school, and learn in a supportive and caring environment.

—To create corn rehensive collaboratives that coordinate services to youth and their families through inter-agency ccoperation and that eliminate barriers to quality services.

(Due to the increased cost of printing, the publication submitted by Ms. Clayton entitled "Results 2000—Progress in Meeting Urban Education Goals" will be retained in the files of the committee.)

The CHAIRMAN. You mentioned those statistics on the urban schools, but we are running long in time. I am going to ask everyone here, I run a general rule that the people file their statements and speak. If people are going to testify on our committee, they are going to know their subject and speak on it. We are glad to have people for one reason, particularly our witnesses that haven't testified before, but we will file everyone's testimony and ask them to summarize it. We have good witnesses here who know their subject. We will move along.

Ms. MCKENZIE. Thank you, Senator Kennedy. Floretta McKenzie of the McKenzie Group. I will, indeed, summarize my statement because Dr. Clayton's comments were comprehensive and on target.

I remember very clearly Hameen Diggins reminded us that we often highlight the negatives, and so one of the reasons I have been invited is, since leaving the superintendency in the District of Columbia, my work has taken me to many urban school districts throughout the country. And in doing so, while seeing the problems that have been recounted by Superintendent Clayton, I also recognize that we have many bright, talented, energetic, and hopeful students in spite of the problems that are borne disproportionately by children in our cities who are a majority African American and Hispanic. These problems, as educational reform efforts have developed nationwide in the last decade, it is increasingly clear that if the reform is to succeed, their proving grounds must be the Nation's cities.

Urban youths, of course, have substantial gaps in achievement. A great concern to superintendents and to communities. But the disparities in academic performance may understandably be overshadowed by the more immediate and threatening issues which too frequently characterize their lives: homelessness, drugs, and substance abuse, teenage pregnancy, poor health and crime.

It has already been mentioned that the facilities are often dilapidated, but a study conducted by the Institute for Educational Leadership found that many teachers do not have basic instructional materials. A shortage of text, supplies and equipment adds to the stress and frustration of demanding situations in our urban centers. Even more pronounced is the shortage of qualified minority teachers. In 1970, 12 percent of the teaching force in public schools was African Americans; in 1985, only 8 percent African Americans. It is projected by the end of the century only 5 percent of the teaching force will be African American, while almost one-third of the student population will come from African American, Hispanic, Asians, and other minorities.

I believe there are serious consequences for this country if we don't give real attention to our urban school districts. These consequences are within the area of economic, social, and political consequences. Of course, we know that many of our students will become unskilled and uneducated in a workforce that is already being threatened by the effective efforts of other countries. The social consequences are also grave. We are already seeing the deteriora-

tion of many families and recognize that if males are unemployed, then it is very difficult to establish families.

Urban education must certainly become a priority, and as Superintendent Clayton indicated, this requires a concerted effort. The complexity of problems defy simple solutions, and so many of our recent reform efforts seem to have simplistic solutions or band-aid approaches. And we also must recognize that educators alone cannot solve the problems of our urban education systems.

In light of the seriousness of problems facing urban schools, it would seem that the need for decisive action would be clearly evident, and that advocates on behalf of urban education would be plentiful. But a Rand Corporation report indicated that urban schools are very isolated from the supportive forces they need to effectively address the complex problems that they now face.

The national goals did not reflect some of the critical elements so important to urban constituencies. And as the previous speaker indicated, the Council of Great City Schools has developed an urban initiative with an urban education summit occurring just this weekend. These school districts have come together, these 47 and another urban school district, to indicate the goals that they will be, indeed, implementing that are, indeed, in keeping with the national goals. They are also indicating strategies, programs, and activities to implement these goals. But, again, the urban school district must look to other organizations, the private sector, and to congressional leadership to help implement the goals so that the real future of our democracy and national well-being rests on success not only of some children but the success of all students.

I will be glad to respond to questions.

[The prepared statement of Ms. McKenzie follows:]

Prepared Statement of Floretta Dukes McKenzie

The serious problems that today plague Americas schools, and, in particular, threaten to cripple inner city youth and urban communities, are well documented and widely lamented. The educational dilemmas which currently are confounding parents, teachers and administrators in rural and suburban schools are only magnified and multiplied in the Nation's cities.

These burdens are borne in disproportionate numbers by the children of African-American and other minority populations that live in the poverty- stricken, inner cores of America's major cities. In 1987, the Council of Great City Schools reported that among its membership of 45 large school districts, 75 percent of the total school enrollments were minority children.

The problems, while alarming to all, have not been exaggerated. They are substantiated by research and testimony of those at the core of the struggle as well as objective observers. As educational reform efforts have developed nationwide in the last decade, it has become increasingly clear that if these efforts are to succeed, their proving grounds must be the Nation's cities.

A SAMPLING OF THE ISSUES

The research on academic achievement alone tells a compelling and tragic story of education's shortcomings. According to studies cited in Youth Indicators, 1988, the marked discrepancy on standardized tests among ethnic groups still exists and in some locales, is widening. A variety of reading, math and writing proficiency tests, for example, all revealed substantial gaps in achievement along racial lines, with white children consistently outscoring African American and Hispanic children at the same age level. Even more disheartening is the evidence that the older the students are, the more pronounced the achievement gaps between white and minority students become.

On literacy tests for young adults. the differences among ethnic groups is dramatic; over 60 percent of the white students scored at the higher proficiency level on these test instruments, as compared to roughly 29 percent of black and 38 percent of hispanic youth.

Given these rates of diminished success in school among minority students, it is not surprising that these same trends are evident in the Nation's dropout statistics. A number of studies have concluded that schools with substantial low-income, minority populations have the highest dropout rates. In fact, recent figures show that in some large city districts, dropout rates may approach, or even exceed, 50 percent.

To urban youth, the disparities in academic performance may understandably be overshadowed by the more immediate and threatening issues which too frequently characterize their lives: homelessness, drug and substance abuse, teen pregnancy, poor health, and crime. One source estimates that a half million U.S. children are homeless today. As reported in the July, 1989 Issue of The American School Board Journal, school officials in Newark, NJ, report homeless children comprise one third of the total school enrollment on any given day.

All schools today are grappling with an array of complex societal issues which have insinuated their way into virtually every community. For urban education, the difficulties are compounded by fewer financial resources, greater levels of student need, teacher shortages and inferior facilities.

Urban school buildings that were once a source of community pride are now in need of desperate repair and renovation. Costly asbestos removal, rewiring, and new plumbing are the basic repair needs of almost every city school district. Yet securing funds for these improvements and regular maintenance is increasingly difficult, forcing many school system leaders to divide scarce dollars among a host of facility needs, increasing salary requirements, an absence of adequate teaching supplies and equipment and a myriad of other educational necessities.

A study conducted by the Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL) of 31 urban schools found that besides working in a substandard physical environment, many teachers do not have basic instructional materials. Shortages of texts, supplies, and equipment add to the stress and frustration of already demanding situations. In short, IEL concluded, "The working conditions of [urban] teachers are bleak and would not be tolerated in other professions."

In the same study, 27 of the 31 schools (87 percent) acknowledged staff shortages. This same shortage is also being felt on a national level as fewer college-bound youth are pursuing careers in education. In addition, universities contend that, in many cases, those entering the teaching profession are not our Nation's "best and brightest." Higher earning power, and better working conditions in other professions are luring talented college graduates away from service in the Nation's classrooms.

Even more pronounced, however, is the shortage of qualified minority teachers. In 1970, 12 percent of the teaching force in public schools was black; by 1985, only 8 percent of the teaching corps was black, and some projections forecast that the percentage will drop to below 5 percent by the Year 2000. This dwindling resource is especially critical now when the numbers of minority school-age children are substantially increasing.

THE CONSEQUENCES

What is at stake in failing to conquer the present problems confronting education?

America's schools have traditionally been at the heart of the communities they serve. A fundamental institution in our Nation's history, public schools have been one of the few places where rich meet poor, the advantaged mingle with disadvantaged, and where, ideally, political, religious, and ethnic boundaries would not exist.

As a nation, Americans have entrusted their most precious resource—children—to the public schools. Many children, in fact, spend more time in classrooms with school staff than at home with their parents. In many drug-worn city neighborhoods, school has become the best available haven of safety and security for children. In essence, the Nation literally invested its future in this institution.

Given this backdrop, if the country gives up on the "grand experiment" of public education, its economic, social, and political well-being will be placed in jeopardy.

The economic consequences of an uneducated and unskilled youth are profound. Dependency rates of elderly to youth have and will continue to shift. To put this shift in perspective, in the 1950's there were 17 people working for retiree; in the 1990's there will be three. To remain economically strong in today's highly competitive global market, American businesses must be able to count on a stable work-

force made up of individuals who are committed to working "smarter." Not only will the workplace demand basic literacy and computing skills, it will also require higher order thinking abilities for retrieving, organizing, analyzing, summarizing, synthesizing, and applying vast amounts of readily accessible data.

An unskilled and uneducated workforce threatens America's economic stature and power on the world front and our Nation's businesses at home. Already, employee literary and training programs are costing corporations millions of dollars each year. American businesses are having to teach basic skills that employees failed to learn in school. The costs to the Federal, State, and local governments are equally high. In many cities, tax bases are shrinking while the number of unemployed and unskilled individuals who depend on government support for survival is swelling.

Specifically at risk are thousands of urban youth who, with few or minimal skills, have dropped out of school. A 1985–86 U.S. Department of Labor study reports that of the 562,000 dropouts, over 300,000 were unemployed. These individuals are unlikely to be able to support themselves or their families as adults. The public will pay the costs for their shelter, clothing, food, health care, and perhaps even incarceration and rehabilitation, as statistics cited in the recently released demographic study, The Same Client, indicate that 82 percent of America's prisoners are high school dropouts. Indeed, already governments and the private sector are stretching to support the unskilled, uneducated, and unemployed.

The social consequences are equally grave. Again, shifts in demographic patterns are having tremendous impact on the Nation's social fabric and, hence, its schools. Harold Hodgkinson. author of The Same Client, writes on the "short cycle family." In large cities, It is not unusual to find a 45-year-old great grandmother living in poverty with her 30-year-old daughter, 15-year granddaughter and newborn great granddaughter.

According to recent figures, an estimated 90 percent of black teens who give birth decide to keep their babies. Adequate and affordable childcare facilities are scarce in urban areas. Many poor adolescent mothers find it very difficult to continue attending classes and most drop out of school prior to high school graduation.

Another demographic shift sociologists point to is the shrinking middle income bracket. Since 1940, approximately 80 percent of our population has fallen into this bracket. Projections beyond 1990 suggest that the gap between rich and poor will widen and the middle class will decrease by some 20 percent or more. Low income, minority families will be adversely affected as competition for government support increases and the solid middle income tax base decreases.

Coupled with the social and economic costs of neglecting to educate urban and minority youth are the potential consequences for the basic political foundations of democracy. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 stated, "The security of the Nation requires the fullest development of mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women."

An educated and literate citizenry is the cornerstone of the democratic form of government and national security. For democracy to work, men and women must be able to read, listen, and understand the complex issues that affect them and their families. On the world front, the credibility of democracy is at stake as other nations look to this Nation for better living conditions and the promise of equality and freedom.

MAKING URBAN EDUCATION A PRIORITY

Taken individually, solving any of the school problems noted here requires much concerted effort. The multitude of issues confronting urban education can appear insurmountable. The complexity of the problems defy the sometimes simple solutions touted in recent school reform packages. The band-aid approach will not heal the deep disparities that are endemic and epidemic in the Nation's city schools. And educators alone can not vanquish all the ills that have found their way into classrooms.

Without question, the current picture of urban education is bleak. However. the Nation can not afford to survey the urban landscape with its difficult terrain and now decide that conquering these troubles is a "lost cause." The failure to act, or even momentarily hesitate, in the effort to provide quality education to all American children will hold dire ramifications which will resound far beyond the cities' limits.

In recent years, urban schools and at-risk children have been the focus of a number of studies, reports, and fact-finding commissions. A host of government agencies, research institutions, and professional organizations have generated reams

of literature on issues related to urban education. These include, but are certainly not limited to, the American Council on Education, Education Commission of the States, National School Boards Association, Committee on Policy for Racial Justice, Rand Corporation, and the National Urban League.

A great deal of information is readily available; many educators willingly admit that enough is already known about how children learn, what makes for exemplary teaching, and what constitutes the optimal environment for learning to effectively address the problems of education. Yet, despite all of the public attention and the wealth of knowledge, no single, unifying voice has emerged as a forceful advocate on behalf of urban education. Many trumpets are blaring, but there seems to be no conductor to orchestrate the efforts which will produce the desired outcomes.

In light of the seriousness of the problems facing urban schools, and the accompanying consequences if a large segment of the populace is inadequately prepared and therefore, unable to lead productive, self-sustaining adult lives, it would seem that the need for decisive action would be clearly evident and that advocates on behalf of urban education would be more plentiful. However, as described in a recent Rand Corporation publication, The Federal Role in Education: A Strategy for the 1990's, urban schools are very isolated from the supportive forces they need to effectively address the complex issues they now face:

"Schools have too many liabilities to be attractive to ambitious politicians, cost too much to be popular with business and taxpayer groups, involve too low-status a group of professionals to attract the attention of the academic community and provide services that are too low quality to retain the middle class patronage. The result is that central-city schools are isolated from the mainstream of civic and economic life. Left to their own resources, they will become less well-funded, more controversial, lower quality and more segregated by race and income."

The Council of Great City Schools, a longstanding voice on behalf of urban education, recognizes the immediacy of the urban education crisis and through its Urban Education Initiative, is reaching beyond its 45-member school districts to all national education organizations and the private sector to place the critical urban education issues squarely in the public awareness and to commit themselves to finding successful solutions to these problems.

The Council built upon the national education goals and adopted six related goals which address the particular needs of urban areas. The member districts of the Council believed their actions were needed for a number of reasons.

First, the national goals did not reflect some of the critical elements so important to their urban constituencies. Fffurthermore, the city school districts wanted to "go further" than the national effort; so they acted to develop strategies for achieving their goals and objectives and engaged the attention and support of now more than 700 organizations to help them. In 1991, the council is determined to put more "meat on the bones" of its initial work; to form a national advisory committee; and to develop specific action plans to address the goals.

This is the substance that so far has been lacking from the activities surrounding the national goals. Education in general, and urban education in particular, needs the best base of support it can possibly muster. As we turn to other organizations and the private sector to "press our case," we also must look to our congressional leaders to not only afford us legislation (such as the USA bill) which will help further our goals, but also to send a resounding message to all parts of the country that the real future of our democracy and national well-being rests with the success of all children.

In November 1990, the Council and the participating organizations will further refine the strategies for achieving the goals by working with representatives from each of the Council's member school districts. This work will serve as the basis for a major conference—the Urban Education Summit. The summit is scheduled for January 1991.

As a follow-up to the summit, the council is planning a number of activities to keep the momentum of its broad-based coalition of concerns going. For example, the Council will initiate a number of research and public information activities as well as monitor national progress toward the goals. Some of the functions planned include:

An information clearinghouse: Many school districts, universities and associations are involved with various stdies, reports and research related to improving urban education. The clearinghouse function would serve to collect, organize and disseminate this information.

Electronic Database: To assist in the collection and analysis of quantifiable information regarding urban education, the initiative will include development and/or networking with existing data resources to enable school districts and organizations

easily accessible information in areas such as: enrollments, attendance and truancy rates, budgets, per pupil expenditures, achievement data, course offerings, etc. Additionally, a data profile of each urban school district will be developed and entered in the database. Wherever possible, project staff will attempt to utilize existing databases.

Researchers' Network: The initiative will establish ties and working relationships with research organizations and higher education institutions to monitor, promote, and in some instances, help sponsor research related to urban and minority student education. Some examples of the organizatons to be included in the network are MIT's Quality Education for Minorities project and Johns Hopkins' Center for social Organization of Schools and the Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools. the network will assist in informing school districts about emerging research, ways to translate pertinent research into educational practice and assist in the development of a research agenda for the initiative.

Research Agenda: Through the clearinghouse function and the researchers' network, project staff will develop a "research agenda" to pinpoint areas related to minority education in need of study or further exploration. The agenda will be reviewed by a National Advisory Council and a plan for interesting existing research operations in undertaking certain portions of the research agenda.

Legislative Monitoring: The initiative also will emphasize the monitoring of—and reporting on—legislative activity at the national and State levels related to urban education. Information concerning local legislation also will be collected from urban school districts. This information will be included and disseminated through the clearinghouse function and the electronic database capabilities.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Timpane.

Mr. TIMPANE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. It is a pleasure to be here. I will summarize my remarks. Luckily, since I am fourth and last, it will also serve to, since it repeats many of the points made, to summarize.

The CHAIRMAN. We have some very critical problems in the urban areas, and I yield to no one about my concern, but we also have some problems in terms of some of the rural communities. As we are going to try and deal with this by reaching out, I don't minimize what we are facing and have some familiarity in the urban areas. But I hope to the extent that you can we will come back in terms of the questions, because we really want to deal with them. It is a different kind of problem, different kinds of solutions. But to the extent that you might be able to add something to your formal comments, I think it would be useful.

Mr. TIMPANE. I would just agree with what everyone has said about the significance of the national goals effort. While so much more needs to be done than has been, it has already had two quite positive effects, it seems to me.

First, it has brought national and State leadership together with the assumption that they could make common cause around an educational agenda. That may sound like a simple accomplishment, but it is one that has so far in the previous history of the country escaped us. So it is terribly auspicious that national and State leadership have a stated intention to work together to solve these problems.

The second thing is that it puts in a national context the themes of high standards, the themes of education restructuring, and the theme of a focus on at-risk youth which have been the three successive themes of the reform efforts of the 1980's in the States and localities. It brings them up to the national level. I should note that the statement of the President and the Governors at Charlottesville speaks to precisely those three themes which are the themes

that we struggled with so much in the 1980's. It brings them to a national level with everyone working together on them.

That said, let me discuss briefly six problems I see and three solutions, things that need to be done. First of all, as Governor Romer has suggested, there is a great deal of work to be done in the specification, design, and implementation of these goals. The statement from Charlottesville was the bare beginning of the issue. There are, in my judgment, years of work to be done before the goals are well specified with objectives and timetables, all sorts of measures invented which do not yet exist. All of these things must be well and professionally done, or the goals will have no credibility. Second, the national goals effort needs to be accompanied by parallel efforts at the State level, because if we don't have some confidence that the States are working together toward a similar set of goals, once again the process will not only have no credibility, it will have no effect.

Second, there needs to be more acknowledgment that this will cost money, not perhaps staggering amounts of money, but if the goals are not accompanied by a straightforward acknowledgment of the resources it will take to accomplish them, then they will be a sham. Moreover, the worst result may be that the blame will fall not on you, not on us, not on the teachers, but the blame will fall on the kids. We will reach the conclusion that the kids couldn't accomplish the goals, and it will really be because we didn't put the resources into it. So the linkage of whatever these resources are has to be straightforward, once again, if the goal initiative is to have integrity.

The third point I would make is that we really need a political mobilization around this issue, and to say that this issue is not the rage of the country at the moment is to say the very least. My colleague, Gene Maroff, a well-known commentator on this issue who many of you know, he asked 30 about-to-become teachers a few months ago what they thought of the national goals effort, and 28 of them had never heard of it. Now, if that is how the people about to enter the classroom are, one can only imagine what the State of opinion of the public at large is. And I don't see that political mobilization going on.

Where are the task forces throughout the Government? Where are the convocations and hearings out in the land? Indeed, recently there are the similar and parallel efforts throughout the States. Some were held earlier on. Many more need to be held. If we don't have that kind of political mobilization, then it will be "just another program" and it won't be what we hope it will be.

Fourth, I think we need more serious consideration to what I call the missing goal, which is the goal of equity. Not one of the six goals speaks directly to equity in our educational system. Now, indeed, the objectives that are being developed under each goal try to meet this, but I suggest that that is not enough. The United States already permits more disparity in its public education system than any other Nation that I know of. We have some of the best schools in the world and, unhappily, some of the worst. And if this goals effort does not narrow that disparity, obviously in an upward direction, but rather widens it, then in the long run I don't think we will have accomplished anything at all.

Fifth, I suggest we should extend the goals to higher education. They are dealt with only glancingly in the six goals developed so far. It is a subsequent effort, one that we should not ignore.

Finally, the charter and membership of the national bodies developing educational goals should be expanded, in my judgment, in two ways. One is to have more involvement of the national legislature, if you will, and second is to bring the larger civic leadership of the Nation, especially the business community, into some shared responsibility for the goals as well.

Three steps I would suggest that you might wish to consider: First is the adoption of legislation, perhaps such as that proposed last year by Senator Bingaman to authorize and establish a permanent and standing national commission on this area, selected by the administration and Congress and the States, to lead a long-term effort—I stress this—a long-term effort to specify and establish the goals, to build popular understanding and support for them, to identify the programs and resources needed to accomplish them, and to monitor our progress toward them. If we only do the latter—and I think this was Governor Romer's point—if we start with No. 4, we are not likely to accomplish what the goals could.

Second, there must be sufficient authorization and funds in the Department of Education budget to do the research and design work that is needed to multiply the numbers and kinds of effective program models that will help localities reach these goals and, second, as I have suggested, create the assessment instruments needed, many of which currently do not exist.

Third, I would suggest that you consider amending Chapter 2 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to provide some strong incentives for these State and local projects that would reinforce the national initiatives. For example, State efforts to develop educational goals and standards; State efforts to help restructure local school systems; State efforts to create the kind of comprehensive approaches that have helped Mr. Diggins, our first witness this morning, so much to deal successfully with the problems of at-risk children and youth. If the State projects funded under Chapter 2 were all to be aimed at these three objectives, I think that would accelerate our progress toward the achievement of the hopes of the national goals initiative.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It is a pleasure to be here.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Timpane follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF P. MICHAEL TIMPANE, PRESIDENT, TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am delighted to join in this morning's consideration of national goals for American education. Such goals are a necessary and desirable part of the future of American education. Their development is an auspicious culmination of the educational reform initiatives launched in the 1980's and an important turning point, suggesting new directions in education policy development during the 1990's.

By saying this, I confess myself an optimist, both in my estimation of the impact of reforms in the 1980's and the possibilities for the 1990's, which seems to many to be starting off as a less hopeful decade. But education is all about hope. It is, year in and year out, the most hopeful thing this or any society does—to prepare its next generation for a good future.

Admittedly, the past year has seen far too little progress in understanding and achieving the potential of our national effort to establish appropriate expectations

and performance for our schools and young people. This is a situation that national leadership can quickly correct.

Since the Education Summit of the President and Governors in the fall of 1989 and the promulgation of national goals in the President's state of the union message last year, this issue has not commanded the Nation's attention at any level. Important developmental work has been done, but the progress promised by such a rare gathering of our Nation's leaders has simply not occurred. Let us hope that these hearings and the initiatives reportedly destined to be unveiled in the President's state of the union message will give new life to the enterprise.

PREPARING THE WAY: THE EDUCATION REFORM PROPOSALS OF THE 1980'S

This hearing is not about the progress made in the 1980's, but we should review what we have recently accomplished in order to see what should characterize the years ahead. In short, the 1980's saw the emergence of a new agenda for educational reform and improvement in the cited States. The agenda had three major components, which emerged successively over the past 10 years. The first was the establishment of higher standards and more extensive requirements for America's schools, teachers, and students, and the development of elaborate mechanisms of accountability and assessment to create and monitor the improvements in outcomes, which were seen to be the essential criteria for these reforms.

The second component focused on strengthening the teaching profession and restructuring the schools. This reform insisted that the level of required performance cannot be accomplished simply by tinkering with the organization of the schools or by improving the pay and working conditions of teachers. It suggested that we need to invent a new kind of school for the 21st Century, changing dramatically the role played by professional educators, reinvolving parents and the wider community in the development and achievement of high standards in each and every school and classroom, and changing the behavior of school systems so that such developments would be fostered rather than smothered. It also suggested that to operate and sustain the effectiveness of these kinds of schools would require teachers of a high caliber, well prepared to take on the authority and responsibility to create exciting new education programs.

The third and most recent component of reform in the 1980's focused on the need for dramatic improvement in the educational opportunities and performance of at-risk children—the children of poverty and of color, the children often clustered and isolated in decaying and growingly dangerous urban neighborhoods. Here, there was special emphasis on early intervention to give these children a fighting chance when they arrive at school, and upon the necessity to forge comprehensive approaches, so that schools, community agencies, parents, and citizens could deliver the array of services in health, welfare, employment training, education, and family and community development needed to assure success in these young people's lives.

As important as these reform initiatives have been, of equal significance was the emergence of a new political coalition promoting them. This coalition consisted most significantly of state-level policymakers, especially governors, a newly engaged business community, and some—but not all—educational leaders. Often bypassing traditional channels of education policymaking, and many educators and teachers in the process, these reformers produced an unprecedented amount of education policymaking, accompanied by tens of billions of dollars of new investment, mostly at the state level. At the same time, they left grass roots suspicion among teachers and local school administrators and school boards, who were rarely consulted in the development of the reforms. Thus, a paradox has emerged-how to reconcile the bewildering variety of top-down state-level mandates for improvement with the presumed imperative that the improvements themselves needed to be bottom-up in character. Also, characteristic of the reforms of the 1980's was a radically different role for the Federal Government, especially the executive branch. The theme was, in essence, "no new programs". During the early 1980's, the Reagan administration was preoccupied with its plan to eliminate the Department of Education and sharply scale back Federal education activities—punctuated ironically by Secretary Bell's stimulating a revival of national interest in education in A Nation at Risk. The latter half of the decade was characterized by a programmatic and financial stalemate between the Administration and Congress, accompanied by strong rhetorical criticisms and admonishments from the bully pulpit of the secretaryship. Whatever one might think of the views that Secretary Bennett propounded during those years, one must admit that he established the capacity of the office to direct or bend the national dialogue on education and to force consideration of the views he proposed.

THE NATIONAL GOALS INITIATIVE

Coming at the end of this decade of great energy and imagination at the local and state level but rhetorical gridlock at the national level, the national goals initiative had two immediately positive effects. First, it brought national and state leadership together, with the assumption that they could make common cause in developing a national (not federal) educational agenda and work together to accomplish it. This was an unusual event—as has been noted, one of only three times in the Nation's history that the President and Governors have come together to consider topic. The second benefit of the initiative was to reframe in a national context the themes of high standards, educational restructuring, and focus on at-risk youth—themes which had come to characterize the myriad but diffuse state and local reforms of the 1980's—and to project them as a truly national agenda for education.

In this regard, the national goals initiative acknowledges that the problems of American education are truly national problems. The joint statement of the President and Governors made this clear when it said, "A well-educated population is the key to our future. Americans must be prepared to:

* Participate effectively in the workforce and in internationally competitive economy;
* Participate knowledgeably in our democracy in our democratic institutions; and
* Function effectively in increasingly diverse communities and States and in a rapidly shrinking world."

These are truly national problems, shared, to be sure, by every State and locality, but needing to be considered and solved by national initiative—every level of government working toward the same goals, with appropriately tailored state and local objectives and strategies. Simple as this seems, we have never before had such an admission or ambition, nationally.

In this respect, the national goals initiative is only part of a growing national focus on education. If one considers the perspective of Nation at Risk and many succeeding reports, or the growing scope of the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP), or the creation of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, or the many unified activities of the National Governors' Association, one can see that the national goals initiative is not an isolated phenomenon.

National goals should be symbols of the commitment of our public leadership and citizenry to excellence in education. As former Governor Dick Riley of South Carolina has said, "Simply put, the citizens of any school district, the citizens of any state, the citizens of any nation, are not likely to achieve more in education than they and their leaders expect and aim for."

The goals themselves are, then, initial statements of appropriate expectations. Some are more realistic and attainable than others (with "first in the world in math and science by the Year 2000" being a particularly romantic hope). But taken together, they clearly aim the nation's programs in a consistent and commendable direction.

That said, there are many important issues to be resolved before this initiative can fulfill its promise:

1. The specification, design, and implementation involved in establishing or monitoring national goals are staggering tasks. The admirable efforts of the commission Governor Romer heads and its working groups are important and timely—and all that one could ask them to do in a few months' time. But they are certainly not enough. Each goal needs definition, as well as objectives, timetables, and measures that do not yet exist. The national goals need to be accompanied by the efforts of each State to adapt and reinforce the goals. Otherwise, there will be no way to know whether the Nation is moving toward the same goals, and if so, how.

2. There is little acknowledgement of or commitment to the programs and resources which will be needed to help people achieve the goals. My colleague, Professor Linda-Darling Hammond, makes this argument well: If the goals movement is primarily about setting and measuring a list of discrete objectives, it will be a superficial reform indeed. Only if it tackles the structural reforms needed to achieve true educational change will it be a serious initiative. Accomplishing the latter, Darling-Hammond says, will require solid understanding of the nature and causes of educational performance in American schools and the effectiveness of various reform strategies, and the likely effectiveness of proposed new initiatives—as well as incentives for their adoption.

There must also be a realistic assessment of the costs of these programs, not necessarily staggering, but real. Without a commitment to effective programs and the money needed to run them, the goals initiative risks becoming a great hoax, because the objectives will surely not be met, and the blame will fall not upon us or even

upon teachers and educators, but upon the students themselves, who will have been deemed unable to make the grade. The single occurrence I know of where any additional programs and resources have been promised and delivered is the case of Head Start, for young children in poverty. This initiative, while praiseworthy, is scarcely sufficient to achieve the proposed goal of school readiness, let alone set the stage for the accomplishment of any others.

3. A political mobilization will be necessary to educate the American people about the necessity, the benefits, and the costs of accomplishing the goals that have been set forth. Gene Maeroff, a keen observer of education, recently asked thirty teacher candidates what they thought about the new national goals—only to discover that 28 of the 30 were unaware that the goals even existed. If this is true for people about to enter the profession, the case of the less engaged public must be worse indeed.

* We need to have task forces throughout the Department of Education and the government working on the definitional, programmatic, and measurement questions involved in establishing and meeting goals.

* There should be convocations and hearings throughout the Nation to explain and mobilize public opinion—such as Secretary Bell inaugurated in the course of the development of A Nation at Risk.

* There should be goal-setting efforts taking place in every State. Such efforts took place in preparation for the Summit a year ago, but few have been undertaken since then.

One thing we should have learned from the education reform movement of the 1980's is that the goals themselves can be useful, but their real strength will come only when people throughout the Nation and American education feel an ownership of them.

4. We need more serious consideration of the relationship of the goals to other imperative issues of education, notably that of equality. There is no particular goal that directly addresses the questions of equity in American education. The strategy so far has been to deal with questions of equity as objectives within each goal. It may be misguided to think of the problems of inequity as subsets of the other problems rather than distinctively different, more serious problems requiring distinctively different solutions. That is precisely the assumption we have often and mistakenly made in the past.

If we were to achieve the proposed national goals and, in the process, increase the disparity in achievement between the most and least privileged, we would have accomplished nothing at all. Already the United States permits a greater disparity of educational outcomes among its schools than any other nation. We have some of the best schools in the world and, unhappily, some of the worst. A primary outcome of the national goals initiative must be to narrow these disparities dramatically and never permit them to recur. I believe that this goal must be much more forcefully stated and acted upon than it has been so far.

5. We should extend the national goals effort to higher education, now covered only glancingly within one of the six goals. Higher education, as much as the precollegiate area, needs the vision, the focus, and the national leadership that a goals effort can produce, and we should waste no time in embarking upon the identification of an appropriate set of goals to be sure that our institutions of higher education retain and indeed solidify their place as the greatest system of advanced learning in the history of the world. These goals must include specific attention to the responsibility that higher education must take in the improvement of the precollegiate system.

6. Finally, the charter and membership of the national bodies developing education goals must be expanded. The entry of the President and the Governors into this effort is a marvelous first step, but two extensions must follow. First, as Senator Bingaman, among others, has urged in his proposed legislation, we must involve the national legislature in the shared responsibility of adopting and achieving national goals. And we must bring the larger civic leadership of the Nation, especially the business community, into co-responsibility as well. These specific legislative steps could move this process swiftly forward:

1. Adoption of legislation, such as that proposed last year by Senator Bingaman, to authorize and establish appropriation levels for a Standing National Commission on Educational Excellence—selected by the Administration, Congress, and the States—to lead a long-term effort to specify and establish goals, build popular understanding and support for them, and identify the programs and resources needed to accomplish them and monitor our progress toward them.

2. Insure sufficient funds for the Department of Education to accomplish the research and design work needed to:

a. multiply the numbers and kinds of effective program models, and
b. create the assessment instruments needed to monitor progress toward goals at every level of government and of schooling.
3. Amend Chapter 2 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to provide strong incentives for state and local projects that would reinforce the national goals initiative, namely:
a. efforts to develop and achieve State and local educational goals and standards;
b. efforts to restructure local education systems and schools;
c. efforts to create comprehensive approaches—among schools and other agencies—to deal successfully with the problems of at-risk children and youth.
As I suggested at the outset, the movement toward national education goals is inevitable and salutary. It can be the guiding effort for bringing our Nation together around the imperatives of education reform and improvement in the coming decade. But we need more concentrated thinking, more commitment of resources, and, most of all, more political leadership-education of the public, if you will.
Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. I would ask our staff, we will have an 8-minute time limit so that we can all get at least a first round. And we have another panel as well.

Governor Romer, let me be very candid. I think all of us who have had the opportunity to work with you in the past in a variety of different issues have enormous admiration for your own dedication. And I think anyone that heard your testimony this morning knows about the seriousness with which you are carrying through your responsibility as chairman of the Governors' Association in the areas of education. But I think there is a reasonable question about how much has really been accomplished and how much support you are getting in terms of carrying forward the kinds of announcements that we had last year, the hoopla, the various press conferences and all the rest that I think all of us were aware of at the time when this program was announced.

I have two problems. I think there is a widespread at least perception that the goals panel is dependent upon the administration and, quite frankly, that it is in their pocket. I think you will have to demonstrate the independence and the autonomy. And, second, the real question is whether there has been enough time to build consensus about the goals, how we are going to reach them and how we are going to monitor them. You made some reference about that this morning. But I don't sense a widespread commitment to the goals by the rank-and-file educators and administrators. There was that story in yesterday's New York Times where they took 30 education majors in college and asked them what they thought about the goals and found that 28 of the 30 had never even heard of them.

What do you have for a budget on the goals panel, and where does the money come from?

Governor ROMER. Senator, I will be equally candid back. When this was formed, I had some views about it. I inherited something that I did not craft, but I took the assignment seriously. I was given the assignment of chairing the panel without any funds, without any staff, and I had a very serious intention of keeping it independent of the White House and independent of the Department of Education because that was its mandate. Now, that is difficult to do under those circumstances. What did we do? We found $400,000 in the Department of Education which would be assigned

41-189 - 91 - 3

to the panel, and it is available. So it has been under-funded, and I understand that.

Second, there was a difficult time in the early days of this panel to maintain its independence, but it has been accomplished. Let me say as chairman I am not owned by anybody; the panel isn't owned by anybody; and it is an independent operation.

Third, Congress. I did not think that it was wise when it was put together to have Congress be ex officio. I made that known. I lost that point of view. I think that is still a matter that needs to be addressed by those who put the panel together, but there are feelings which I don't need to repeat here this morning that caused that initial decision to be made.

Fourth, we do not have a national mobilization yet on this issue, and I think the professor is correct that we need one. But let me tell you there is one thing we have done, and I think it is the most important thing to do. We have reached out and gotten hold of the best minds of this country on assessment. We have them working with us. We have five resource groups, and they are chaired on readiness by Ernest Boyer, on achievement by Lauren Resnick, on math and science by Alvin Trivelpiece, on the literacy question by Mark Musick, and on crimes and drug-free schools by Dr. Joe Fernandez, and Dr. Clayton is a member of that resource group.

We have succeeded in going after the talent that we need on expertise——

The CHAIRMAN. All right. I am going to come back to a question just on that. I didn't want to cut you off, but I have a question just on that. As I understand, there are 12 members of the panel. Is that correct?

Governor ROMER. There are 14. Four from Congress, four from the White House, six Governors.

The CHAIRMAN. How many members have attended both meetings? Do you know?

Governor ROMER. Well, the Governors?

The CHAIRMAN. For the preponderance. Let's just say better than half the meetings.

Governor ROMER. OK. The Governors have been in attendance. On the White House staff, Roger Porter has attended each of the meetings. And we have had some participation by John Sununu and by the Secretary of Education.

The CHAIRMAN. Have they attended all the meetings, both the meetings?

Governor ROMER. The Secretary of Education has. But, of course, we had a change in that, and the deputy was at our last meeting. But John Sununu has been at both meetings briefly. He was at a luncheon prior to the meeting. We spent an hour-and-a-half at lunch prior to our last meeting. he didn't attend the panel itself. The first meeting he attended a half-hour of the panel. Mr. Darman we have not seen.

The CHAIRMAN. Maybe you would just provide this so we find out who is attending and who is participating, if you would.

Now, we have the list of the various goals here. You have outlined a little bit now and in the earlier response. Our time is moving on. We heard the other night from Mr. Timpane and others made reference in terms of the resources, that we are going to need

resources to be able to accomplish this. You know, we hear the old slogan you can't solve problems by throwing money at them. We all agree with that, but it is a pretty good indication of what our priorities are as a country, as a Nation, and whether we are really serious about this.

I was troubled. I watched the other night, the Monday program on Channel 7 at 11:30 where the President was interviewed by David Frost. The President was asked, Don't you sometimes want to spend more money on education? The President responded, "Not so much on education." And that, I thought, was disheartening at best, after we had a good many comments. Of course, in the campaign, he wanted to be the education President. Now we have tried, passed in the Senate the President's education program last year, a year-and-a-half ago, unable to get the full program through the Senate in the final hours. But that obviously is distressing and disturbing, particularly when we have Dr. Clayton and others point out the needs of the urban areas, and I think we have needs in rural areas as well.

But given where that is coming from, if that is the position, given your own assessment of what is available in terms of the States and the urban areas, can you tell us about where we are a year into the announcement of these goals, national education goals in each of these areas? What can you tell us where we are in each of them and where do we really have the most work to do? I wish you would, to the extent that you can, tell us where the Federal responsibility is, State and local.

Governor ROMER. Senator, this was one of my concerns about the goals movement. I think it is good, and I want to support it. But we ought not believe that this panel is going to "solve the problems of education in America." We are only one piece of this total approach.

Now, as to your question, where are we in terms of reaching these goals? You know, we are not very much further down the line——

The CHAIRMAN. What is the Federal responsibility, State and local? Give us where we are, what is our Federal responsibility? I think there is the enormous importance of accountability. You know, families don't know who is responsible. Everybody makes the same education speech. You know, our most important asset is our children. We all know that speech. Every politician knows it. But the problem is there are too many that aren't doing anything about it.

Tell us where we are, and then give us your own assessment about what the Federal responsibility is, State and local, just briefly if you can.

Governor ROMER. All right. Let me give it to you briefly. My view is the Federal responsibility on school readiness is that they have not yet funded Head Start as adequately as they ought to fund Head Start. I said that to the President the day that he was down initiating this program.

Now, in terms of our ability to measure the degree of failure, we are not there yet, Senator. We don't have the capacity to measure the degree of failure of making students ready for school. But the

Federal responsibility here, in my judgment, is clearly to participate much more strongly in terms of funding Head Start.

High school completion, the Federal Government does not, in my judgment, have a clear assigned program relating to that. That is a matter of the K-12 program in local and State areas. But I think there is a lot the Federal Government can do to help us over a period of time increase our accomplishment of the goals on high school completion, on students being knowledgeable in the challenging subjects and being first in math and science.

Now, you see, the Federal Government has primarily gone at education support with certain categorical programs, but let me tell you how you can help in Goals 2, 3, and 4. We need to have a capacity, first of all, to arrive at an assessment system. We don't have that capacity. We have NATE which does a sample, and it is funded to do that slowly. But if we are going to develop the capacity to create a national assessment system where it is not just a sample but it is student by student, the Federal Government could be very creative to come in with some matching funds, some initial research funds to help us get that. We as a panel have not yet arrived at the point where we have made a recommendation in that regard.

In reference to literacy and the crime and violence goals, it is obvious that the Federal Government has been in the business of both of those in a number of programs. I do not at this point, as chairman of this panel, have the ability to give you, hey, this is the measure where you ought to be and where you are now. But it is obvious that we have not got sufficient effort in terms of resources, nor have we, in my judgment, made the changes we need to do in reforming the system to produce better with what dollars we are now spending.

The CHAIRMAN. My time has expired. Senator Kassebaum?

Senator KASSEBAUM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First, Dr. Clayton, I would just like to say, as superintendent of schools in Philadelphia, you must be one of an "endangered species," if the recent articles about the diffuculties of retaining or recruiting superintendents in the major cities, sadly enough, are true. So congratulations for being there and for your willingness to stay and fight. I think that unfortunately—and you know all too well, too, Dr. McKenzie—it sometimes almost seems easier to give up than to stay and do the things day after day one has to do.

I would just like to make a couple of comments. One, I am not terribly surprised that a large percentage of students indicated they didn't know about these goals. My guess is most teachers and, certainly, beginning teachers are really more concerned about what they have to do to face their day-to-day teaching than about goals. My guess is, knowing the number of teachers that I do and having worked closely with schools when my children were attending a rural school district, that they are overburdened by requirements. They are overwhelmed by the extracurricular activities they have to supervise and the reports they have to turn in. It seems to me that if we hope to attract the best and the brightest into our educational system, which I think is one of our top goals, we need not only better salaries, but also emphasis on teaching, not just filling out forms, not just babysitting. And we have to able

to enhance the professionalism of teaching so that we can attract and support good teachers.

Yes, it does take money, and it is going to take targeted Federal dollars. I think the urban school bill has certainly some good parts to it, some of which the President addressed in his bill, in terms of flexibility and the desire to reward achievement. I certainly think that the problems of the urban schools have not been exaggerated. I would agree with you, Dr. Clayton. I think it is one of the biggest responsibilities that we have today in this Nation. But I also believe that when we address higher education—and we shouldn't slight that—we are doing a disservice to our young people today. This is more of a speech than it is a question I have.

The CHAIRMAN. Always glad to hear you. [Laughter.]

Senator KASSEBAUM. What I mean by a disservice to our young people today is seeing them graduate from high school and encouraging them to build up debt with their student loans when they have to take remedial reading in college. I don't know, Dr. Clayton, how you or Dr. McKenzie or Governor Romer or Mr. Timpane feel about raising academic requirements for graduation from high school. I really believe we must have higher standards so that we are sending students out of high school prepared at that point. I think one of the saddest stories is your comment, Dr. Clayton, at the end of your testimony about the young man who said he was going to stay in school because he saw a bum. And then he stopped to think that maybe he had finished school and that this is where he ended up. And that has to be what a lot of young people wonder today. Why is it important for them to excel in math and science?

Many of the reports show that Japanese students have a dedication to achievement, and this is a big difference between our system and the Japanese system. I am not trying to compare the two systems because we wouldn't want the Japanese system—but we have got to get back to an emphasis on achievement.

I guess I am somewhat frustrated with the goals that we talk about. Somehow they have got to be translated to the reality of a teacher just trying to get through the day. And that comes from a willingness for us here to lend support to those who are out there struggling with this so that it can be a day-to-day effort, not just something that is caught up in the television headlines of the moment.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, unless someone has a comment. I know it gets very frustrating trying to translate the idealistic to the practical and the reality of the day.

The CHAIRMAN. I think Senator Kassebaum has put her finger on an enormous dilemma that we are facing. On the one hand, if you don't have the young people that get out of the school that are able to have the basic kind of skills, we go ahead and provide those loan programs, and we are going to see a deterioration in both the taxpayer support for those programs and a deterioration in the programs. On the other hand——

Senator KASSEBAUM. Well, it is unfair to the students.

The CHAIRMAN. And on the other hand, you know, you are caught in the dilemma of what are you as a society going to do with young people in this. How are we going to deal with them? We haven't been terribly creative in terms of how we are going to

meet that challenge. We had an enormously interesting report from Ray Marshall, that commission report. I see a number of our witnesses commenting upon that dilemma of tying the education closer in terms of the worker skills and needs in our society. Perhaps this has been a problem of our hearing. The other day we had just in terms of the recession and what is happening to the workers, the skills, and today we are on education. I think everyone on this panel would agree there has to be a greater blending of these two issues.

Governor ROMER. I would like to speak to both these comments. Senator Kennedy, I understand your frustration about the lack of commitment of resources of the administration to education. I share that. I also understand your frustration of the national goals panel and process being used as a shield about, hey, we are doing our thing, we don't need to do any more. I share that.

Now, my problem is this: There is a real job to be done by this goals panel, and it goes to Senator Kassebaum's question. Finally, education is local in this country. Senator, if we are really to get to a local school and say you are not quite doing the job, you need more resources but also you need to know you are not making it, you need to have a higher level of achievement, how do we get that done? Any poll you take will say, hey, the Nation is going to hell in a hand basket; you know, the States are not doing very well; the District's doing better; my school is great, my teacher is excellent. You know, we all approach that. We need to have an intellectual CAT scan or an educational CAT scan of what we are doing out there.

Now, if we do this job right with this assessment panel, we will develop one. And let me go back to the question of the composition of the panel because that has been testified about. All of you in Congress who are looking at an alternate method ought to think very seriously about this issue. One, whatever we do, we ought not have parallel tracks. We ought to do one. And if we don't have the right track, I am open to find that combination. We ought to have one track. But, two, remember the importance of Governors signing on and saying I will hold myself accountable on an annual basis. If you form a panel that is simply experts, that says we are going to hold up annual report card, the Governor is going to say, fine, do it, we are on down the road.

One of the unique features of what we are doing right now is that Governors have signed on saying we are going to hold ourselves accountable on an annual basis over 10 years on six of the most serious educational goals. That is a gem. Don't lose that gem, whatever you do, if you pass new forms of this. But, finally, I would say we don't have the resources on the table. We do not have the resources to do this job even in developing the assessment methods. And as chairman of this panel, I tell you, you know, I am running a lot of it out of Colorado simply because we don't have the resources here, and we would very much like your help on that end.

The CHAIRMAN. We will let Senator Bingaman have his time to make what comment on that makeup of the panel as he would like.

Senator Pell.

Senator PELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to follow up on Senator Kassebaum's statement a little bit, touching on the Japanese schools. We may not want their system of education, but they seem to learn a lot. My understanding is that every Japanese graduate of a high school knows English. I doubt if many graduates of our high schools knows Japanese, or even good English sometimes. I think that we could do a great deal more in that regard.

In these past months, I have had an opportunity to be home a great deal, and I asked this question to various high school groups: How many of you feel that you could learn a lot more, if you were more challenged, if there were higher goals demanded of you, if you had a longer school year, and spend a longer time in school?

In general, about nine out of ten hands of these young people go up and say they could learn more. The tenth one answers the question saying they are learning what they believe they are capable of at this time. It is a very interesting test to give, and I would suggest to anybody in this room that you should try it out sometime when you are with a high school class, and you will get this surprising answer.

I think one point here about the problems we face is the fact that we have 16,000 sovereign school committees, each with their own idea, not drawing particularly on the Federal and State level. I for one question how we can really get an A–1 school system, an A–1 educated citizenry with 16,000 sovereign groups setting the curriculum and the requirements across the country.

Also, going back to the school year for a second, I am struck by the fact that in this country half the year is a holiday: 180 days for vacation and 180 days for school. Our competitors have more: for example, Sweden has 200, the Soviet Union 210, Canada 200, Thailand 220, South Korea 220, Israel 216, Italy 213, and Japan 243 days. I think just that step alone would produce a more educated citizenry.

Finally, I am struck, too, by the need for a national exam of some sort, sort of like a national regents test as in New York. I would point out that in the 1988 reauthorization of the ESEA Act, a provision was made authorizing the Secretary to develop such an optional test. This is something I have been working on for maybe 15 years now, and this is not very far to have gotten. And I was wondering if there is any possibility in your minds of seeing us moving down the road and making it mandatory, not optional. I would be very interested in the comments of any of you on these sorts of exams.

Governor ROMER. Making mandatory, not optional what?

Senator PELL. The preparation of such a test, which would not have to be administered, but I think the very fact that such a test existed would mean that the sovereign school committees would try to make sure their kids could pass that test and would have a greater uniformity of curriculum.

Governor ROMER. Senator, let me speak, and then I will let the rest of the panel comment on it. I again tried to zero in on what I thought was the greatest polarizing problem, and it was this tradition of local control as over against the national test, and that is why I have been — and this is not a position of the panel yet, but I have been advocating to the panel that we try some method by

which we can use a cluster approach, so that we have alternate tests which are calibrated to each other. I think that is salable, politically, but we need to have some resources, frankly, to get that job done. And one of the most creative things could do right now for this panel would be to give us a kick and some funds to get it done and say, okay, go do it. You know, we need to have an assessment system in this country that really tells us where we are, and I think we could do it, if we had an accelerated time frame and we could get on with funding it.

Ms. MCKENZIE. If I may, I am very much interested in the discussion about assessment, but it seems that we will allocate money for assessment before we will allocate money to implement programs. It is not that we do not need both.

I think that school districts and States need a benchmark to know where they are, so they know where they have to go, and I think it would be unfortunate for poorer States to be measured in the same way with more affluent States.

As Dr. Timpane has indicated, we do have some very serious equity issues. Part of what will happen, it seems to me, in seeking to implement national goals without resources, that will have the people who already feel as if they are failures, feeling that way more so.

Timpane indicated that the burden of the failure will reside with the students, but that is not quite true. The burden of the failure will fall on urban and rural educators, and one of the reasons why we are having difficulty with leadership is because we have set out certain goals and reform in this national goal effort, and if that change and improvement does not come quickly enough, the boards respond by getting rid of the superintendent, rather than developing a long-term plan for achievement and measuring periodically whether you are getting there.

There are some other movements that are going in this country with respect to rigorous courses. For example, the college board is now working with 6 school districts, trying to get them to mandate algebra and geometry for all students, because we are caught up in this country in tracking and watered-down courses.

They have found through the research that 80 percent of the African-American students and just about that many of the Hispanic students who take algebra and geometry go on to postsecondary education and are successful, but you find only 17 percent of the African-Americans and Hispanic students taking algebra and geometry. So, now the college board, with the help of the Ford Foundation, is trying to get school districts, and 6 have agreed to try it, to implement pre-algebra, algebra and geometry for all students.

We have got to move beyond categorizing and slotting certain students for success or higher levels of achievement and fulfillment in society, while slotting others for lesser roles, and I think that if this Congress could get behind movements—and, goodness knows, we have had some very important research done, and just this one in algebra—that is not a panacea, because you have got to get trained math teachers.

You know, when we say that the solutions are not simple, they are not, but I would hope that whatever we do at the governors' level, at the national level and at the local level, we do not contin-

ue the school-bashing and people feeling like failures, but develop some incentives, some benchmarks and realize that it is going to take long-term commitment to really turn around our school districts, particularly the achievement levels of all students must go up.

Senator PELL. Thank you. I only have one more minute left.

Dr. Clayton.

Ms. CLAYTON. I would just like to say that all of this discussion is particularly interesting. Ladies and gentlemen, I would ask you not to see education in isolation of some other real needs of kids. I mean, I am distressed to think that we are talking about an assessment of curriculum. We have head to talk about the health needs of our children and the inability to have access to health care.

I do not want to tell you the percentage of my children who need health care. I do not want to tell you the percentage of my kids who need food and nutrition. We get 15 million meals a year, and these things are inextricably interwoven and we cannot view this morning's discussion, this bill or anything else in isolation of what is happening to children and to families.

We have 3,000 homeless children in the School District of Philadelphia. They move every 3 weeks, every 3 months. We have had to make some changes in the way we were responding. Therefore, I would appeal to you to not view this, as Flo has said, in a categorized way, in isolation of the total needs, so that we may address our young people in a more humane manner.

Senator PELL. Thank you. My time has expired. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Simon.

Senator SIMON. I would just like to say that your 1-minute statement, Dr. Clayton, is probably more significant than anything. I do not mean any disrespect to anybody else, but it really is very, very significant.

We do the very same thing with the drug problem. We look at the drug problem, we do not look at unemployment, we do not look at these other things that clearly are related.

A comment or two about what some of my colleagues have said, and then a couple of questions. Senator Kassebaum and Senator Pell both talked about Japan, what Japan is doing. It is very interesting. Japan is paying teachers approximately the same as they pay lawyers and physicians, and in Japan those going into teaching score way above average in college entrance scores.

In the United States—and Dr. Timpane knows more about this than I do, but, unfortunately, we do not have the same experience, either in scores or in pay, and we are paying for it. We are paying for it dearly.

Senator Pell mentioned about the Japanese students knowing English. In virtually every country, in fact, in every country I know of, all elementary school students study foreign languages. In the United States, fewer than 1 percent of our elementary school students study foreign languages.

You know, we just cannot continue this kind of neglect, and it is particularly true, Dr. McKenzie, for minority students. There is an assumption that somehow they cannot master these, you know, and that puts the minority students at a disadvantage.

I want Hameen, if I can pick on you back there, Hameen, I want you to study a foreign language at some point along the line in your education. OK? All right. He is nodding.

The CHAIRMAN. The record will show it is a qualified yes. [Laughter.]

Senator SIMON. Governor Romer, I appreciate your leadership and I hope we do something, in one way or another, either through the Federal Government or foundations or some way, for resources for you.

The summit meeting with the governors was a fine thing, but it was basically the President and the Secretary of Education meeting with the governors and saying you do something about it.

Governor ROMER. Yes.

Senator SIMON. We have not had any leadership here in Washington, DC Now, there is, to the credit of the President, there is a new Secretary of Education, Governor Lamar Alexander, your former colleague——

Governor ROMER. Yes.

Senator SIMON. —who I think has the potential to really provide some leadership, and I am encouraged by that appointment. I would be interested in your opinion, since you had a meeting of the President with the governors, a summit meeting, do you think it would be worthwhile for the President maybe to meet with Senator Kennedy and Senator Kassebaum and those of us here and pull in some governors and some educators and maybe have a summit meeting with the people who can do something about it here in Washington, DC?

Governor ROMER. Absolutely. Let me say that—again, speaking frankly—that, since I have taken on this assignment, I obviously see a rift between Congress and the White House on this issue, that it arose when the panel was formed and it is still there. I have been personally trying to help close that. I have visited a number of you here in your office, and I think that conversations between the administration, the President and Congress and the leaders directly on this issue would be very, very helpful.

You know, there is, frankly, a difference of approach. The whole discussion around the formation of these goals were we do not need more resources, all we need to do is use our present resources more wisely. I do not buy that, personally. I think we need both. We need to have more resources on the table and we need to use them more wisely, so I agree, that conversation would be helpful.

The CHAIRMAN. Would the Senator just yield on that?

Senator SIMON. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. I think also, Senator Simon and Senator Bingaman, basically, the tension is to insure not that they are talking to us, but that they are talking to parents and they are talking to educators, they are talking to community leaders, they are talking to the kinds of people that are involved in that program which has affected this young witness today. I think that is the essence.

I will let Senator Bingaman elaborate on it. I do not feel it is so necessary to come and yack with me, but to make sure they are going to have that other dimension. I know, governor, because we have talked about it and you share that kind of view and concern, but I will let Senator Bingaman really develop it.

Senator SIMON. If I can just say, I think you are more important than you think you are, Senator Kennedy. I think it is important. What we are doing right now is we are telling everybody else, you go ahead and do something and the Federal Government is not doing it. I think we need a meeting right here at the Federal level, to say let us devote some Federal resources to doing something, and we need the President and Congress working together on this.

In that connection, Dr. Clayton, I did not realize, I am sorry I did not look at the witness list, when I mentioned earlier your testimony here I think about 3 years ago, when you told about that marvelous intensive preschool program you have in Philadelphia. Then I asked you what percentage of the students who really need it are getting it, and you said about 20 percent.

Ms. CLAYTON. Twenty percent.

Senator SIMON. Now, that was 3 years ago. What is it today?

Ms. CLAYTON. Twenty percent.

Senator SIMON. Twenty percent.

Ms. CLAYTON. We have not had any increase in funding. We have had an increase in inflation and we have not had an increase in funding.

Senator SIMON. So, that means 80 percent, what a tragic loss of resources for Philadelphia and this Nation. Finally, we ultimately get down to resources. I agree with Governor Romer, it is not resources alone, but this old line, just throwing money at it is not going to do any good. I do not hear people saying that about the defense budget. I do not hear them saying that about a lot of other things.

The reality is that we are going to have to devote more resources, and I think that one of the things we maybe ought to look at, that I have heard virtually no discussion on, is, if I can use an analogy, I spoke in my recent campaign about having a half percent increase in social security to take care of the long-term care problem, and I found generally people were willing to have that additional tax, because they knew it went for something specific.

I think if the education community, working together with Congress and working together with the administration, were to come up with some revenue source and say here is what we are going to do, we are going to have say, an increase in the tax on cigarettes, a half percent increase in income tax, and you say let us devote this specific tax to increase educational funding in this Nation, I think the American people would buy it. I really believe that.

Now, my time is up, but any response or reaction——

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Timpane.

Mr. TIMPANE. I think the evidence is mixed, Senator. I would hope that what you say is true. People who follow the property tax history of localities closely would say there is evidence on both sides. The question sometimes which is associated with——

Senator SIMON. If I may interrupt you, the property tax is one of the most inequitable taxes, in terms of how it hits.

Mr. TIMPANE. And also the most visible.

Senator SIMON. Yes.

Mr. TIMPANE. So, I think there are problems of design. I have long been struck by two things you said. One is why is it that education is the only thing that money will not help solve the problem.

That has always been a puzzle to me. And the second thing is that it is always the number one priority, when people are asked freely what they think is the most important issue and the one they would most gladly spend more money for.

The contradiction between those two points has always been politically mystifying to me, politically. If those two things are both so—they both cannot be both so, it seems to me, so there is, it seems to me, a potential, any reassurance the people would have that money be spent on education, it would seem to me, would politically enhance the popularity of the bill. Whether that goes all the way to your proposal of a dedicated revenue source or not, I am not so sure that we know what that source is.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. I just made a comment, we had Joe Fernandez here—an $850 billion bond issue, Dade County, 65 percent of the vote, 70 percent of the elderly. We do not get that. The fact of the matter is that most of the community in my own State, the elderly say we cannot have people in schools and vote against it. He was able to get the elderly people involved before they ever went to the ballot on it—$850 billion, you know, in this kind of climate and atmosphere. No one minimizes the complexity of it, but at least there is some glimmer of hope.

Senator Bingaman.

Senator BINGAMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for calling the hearing.

I wanted to address a couple of comments to Governor Romer, and then ask him some questions which he and I have discussed on other occasions, and they are not surprises to him at all.

First, I want to compliment Governor Romer for the excellent job that he has done as head of this panel that the governors have established to work toward national goals. I do think that significant progress has been made, and I think he has taken an assignment that he was given and worked hard to do a very excellent job with it.

I have some problems with the way it is structure, and I made those concerns very public and I would like to just question you a little about that.

The present structure of the panel is not 14 members, as I understand it, it is 10 voting members and 4 ex officio members. The 10 voting members are the 6 selected governors, yourself included, and 4 representatives of the administration, Mr. Sununu, Mr. Darman, Mr. Porter and the Secretary of Education are from the administration.

Governor ROMER. Right.

Senator BINGAMAN. As you are aware, my concern has been that the panel needed to have a combination of people of the type you identified, elected governors and representatives from the administration,, but also some folks who were not public officials, who were not up for election, and who had expertise and background that would allow them to be, as I would see it, at any rate, independent in their assessment.

I compliment you for setting up the panel that you have made up of those types of individuals, the people you have identified as chairmen, Ernest Boyer and others are superb people who I think we need to rely very heavily on. My only disagreement with the

Governors Association in that regard is I think those people should be voting members, just as the governors are voting members and just as the administration's folks are.

I also, of course, have had some concern that, in order to really insure not only independence, but the appearance of independence, we need to be sure that your funds are not totally from the Department of Education, and you are in the awkward position now, of having $400,000 from the Department of Education. You know, the one with the gold sort of sets the tone for where you come out, and I think that is a concern.

This last year, I think in the waning days of the session, I am sure you are aware that we passed a provision here in the Senate and included it in the appropriations bill that became law, which earmarked $2 million for the use of a panel such as yours, if that panel were to have a majority of voting members who were not Federal appointees or elected officials, and be in line with the bill I introduced this last year that Mr. Timpane referred to, where we had 18 members, 10 of whom were not elected officials.

It also would have the other characteristics of your panel, the entity would be made up of people appointed by the National Governors Association and the President and the leadership of the House and Senate, and that the action of the group would be taken by majority vote, and not the rule which I understand you are operating under, which is that 75 percent of your 10 voting members have to agree, in order for your panel to take an action. Is that correct?

Governor ROMER. That is correct.

Senator BINGAMAN. To put my concern very baldly, you have a one-year term, essentially, and you are coming out with a report this fall.

Governor ROMER. That is correct.

Senator BINGAMAN. I am looking forward to that. I know that it will be difficult to do all that you would like to do, given the constraints. Each year after that, in September, there will be a follow-up report, as I understand it.

I am concerned that, for example, the report that is issued in September of 1992 has to have the support of 75 members of that panel.

Governor ROMER. Seventy-five percent.

Senator BINGAMAN. Senvty-five percent, excuse me, 75 percent of that panel. I have great difficulty believing that the President's representatives are going to vote for anything in the report coming out 2 months before his reelection, which is in any way critical of his administration, for lack of attention to the problems of education.

Now, I do not know that that is what the panel would do otherwise, but I am just saying that it is going to be hard to persuade me and I think a lot of people in the country that the report that comes out in September of 1992 is entirely objective with regard to what it says about this administration's performance in education, in light of the fact that the 4 representatives of the administration, 3 of those representatives have full authority to veto anything that the panel wants to say.

That is a bald statement of the concern I have about the independence of your panel, and it is not meant in any way to question your independence or your commitment to doing the right thing.

Governor ROMER. Yes.

Senator BINGAMAN. I would be interested in any reaction you have to that, and whether you, in light of that concern, think maybe the Congress should follow Mr. Timpane's suggestion and move ahead with legislation that would broaden your panel. I agree totally with you that we should not have two panels, we should not have two tracks going, but we should have one that is credible.

Governor ROMER. Senator, a number of really important questions. Let me speak about them. One, finances, you are right, we ought to have independent funds, we ought not to have to go hat in hand to somebody and say that, but I want to assure you, as chairman, there is absolutely no tainting at this point in time. You have got to know me, as the chairman, to know that is not the case, and I have had a little battle here and there, but those are independent actions of the council.

Second, we do operate on consensus. I inherited that. I think that is a problem. I think when you get down and have to make a decision, you have got to make a decision, so I think that is a fault.

Three, the fact that Congress was made ex officio I think was a mistake. That is a personal point of view, you understand. I am here representing an institution, NGA. It is their policy that it be the way that it is, and I am here to defend that. But I will admit, as I have to you personally, that I think it was a mistake the way that was put together.

Let me say that I am a picture drawer. I have another one, and I have used it a lot. It is a tanker. It is a tanker. I am trying to conduct the first year of this panel in a way that we set such a thing in motion, Senator, that has such momentum, and there is enough people on that tanker that nobody can make mid-course correction radically, just because of a presidential election campaign or any other campaign. Now, that is my own way of trying to build in some protection.

Now, a part of that crew on that tanker were Ernie Boyer, Lauren Resnick and the other people. We have about 40 of the best minds of America working on this issue. I believe we can do the——

Senator BINGAMAN. But none of them have a vote.

Governor ROMER. What?

Senator BINGAMAN. None of those 40 minds have a vote.

Governor ROMER. No, but let me tell you what is going to happen. This panel is not going to sit down and say, hey, this goes in the report. I mean we are not going to alter statistics. This panel is going to say this will be the format of the report, these are the questions we are going to ask the States, then whatever comes out is going to go in the report.

Now, there is an assignment that we have an incapacity to do, and it is to also evaluate the Federal establishment annually, and I will tell you, we do have some limitations with the way in which the panel is composed. We have not taken that issue up and han-

died it. I got a suggestion of what we ought to do, given our present, you know, composition.

Senator, you are correct that this panel has some built-in problem in making an assessment of the Federal establishment. I do not feel that it is incapacitated in making an accurate report of 50 States.

Senator BINGAMAN. My time has run out. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

As I understand, Governor Romer, the education budget appropriates $5 million for something called education summit follow-up. You say you have $400,000. I do not know what has happened to the rest. Maybe you can provide us with—if we can be helpful, I hope you come back to us, but as I understand, you ought to have it.

Governor ROMER. I think that $5 million was set aside for a specific purpose. This $400,000 comes from sources that are in the lap of the administration——

The CHAIRMAN. You mentioned to us and justified to us that it was going to go for your function, and that is just the reason that money was appropriated. I will not take the time of the committee, but maybe we can review that at the staff level.

Governor ROMER. I will find out.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Timpane, you have a very interesting program about training ex-Peace Corps people for teachers to serve in difficult areas. Could you provide that for the record? We have a third panel and we have a very important caucus dealing with the Persian Gulf, and we want to——

Mr. TIMPANE. I would be delighted to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. I invite the members of the committee and their staffs that are here to be interested in that.

Also, Governor Romer, we asked you specifically questions, if you had additional ideas or recommendations outside of your responsibility in terms of chairman of that panel, outside of that, if you would put those in the record, too, if we could ask you for any——

Governor ROMER. I would be glad to.

The CHAIRMAN. These have been pretty specific questions, I think, but you have a very well-deserved reputation as someone who has spent a lot of time and thought about these education issues, and we would value that.

Finally, Senator Wellstone had planned to be here and thank all of the panel. He is speaking to students, the focus group, and so he had to necessarily absent himself.

I want to thank all of you. It has been enormously interesting. Can I ask, Dr. Clayton just about uniforms. You know, we have seen now the superintendent of schools—I understand that parents spent about $1,200 to clothe their kids in school in urban areas and, you know, I hear now here in Washington they are considering uniforms and they cost about $150 to $175, if we do it schoolwide on their part. The reason I heard the superintendent here give is because of the violence and other kinds of things. Have you thought about that?

Ms. CLAYTON. We have not only thought about it, Mr. Chairman, but about 47 of our schools are using uniforms. It is a voluntary procedure, where parents do the selection of the vendor, and ask

for materials which are lightweight, heavyweight for wool. It is certainly inexpensive, compared to the amount of money that families spend. It breaks down some of the jealousies and the inequities of what the family is able to spend. The families like it, the teachers like it, and the students like it, and I find our administrators sand teachers wearing the uniforms and colors of their schools, as well.

The CHAIRMAN. You know, the last thing we need to have is the Federal Government dictating what people are going to wear, and I can already hear it. But if you have some kind of creative way, you have some ideas—you know, we may not even get 5 votes for it, but I would be interested if you or Dr. McKenzie or others had some idea or suggestion. I apologize for that.

Mr. TIMPANE. It is not controversial, Senator, about saying schools are about education, not about fashion.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. Thank you very much.

We will go to our final panel: James L. Bush, founder of his own insurance brokerage firm, chairman and founding member of "I have a Dream" in Boston, a nonprofit organization focused on helping 106 fourth-graders in inner-city school that graduated from high school and go to college. We are very glad to have you here.

We are glad we have all of our witnesses. We have about 45 minutes left for a very important panel. We want to welcome Mr. Bush. We know you are having a good occasion in January, and hopefully Mrs. Bush is going to attend, and we hope it will be very successful.

Chester Finn, professor of education and public policy at Vanderbilt, director of the education excellence network, previously assistant secretary of education for research under President Reagan. He also worked for 4 years as legislative assistant for Senator Moynihan. he has written 6 books, written more than 150 articles on education policy needs.

Dr. Albright, president of Johnson C. Smith University, in Charlotte, NC, and chairman of the board of directors of the American Council on Education, as well as a member of the board of directors of the United Negro College Fund, and has published works on subjects and issues confronting traditional black colleges and teacher education.

Mr. Bush, we are delighted to have you.

STATEMENTS OF JAMES L. BUSH, SPONSOR OF THE "I HAVE A DREAM" PROGRAM AT THE MATHER SCHOOL, DORCHESTER, MA.; PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION AT VANDERBILT, AND DIRECTOR OF EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE NETWORK, WASHINGTON, DC; AND ROBERT L. ALBRIGHT, PRESIDENT, JOHNSON C. SMITH UNIVERSITY, CHARLOTTE, NC

Mr. BUSH. Thank you, Senator Kennedy.

Before I begin, if Dr. Clayton is still here, she has probably gone, but if she is here, I would like her to know that we have a very exciting opportunity up in Boston, if she is tired of being in Philadelphia as superintendent. I would like to make her an offer.

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today, and I hope that some of what I have to say will be of some value, as you consider your agenda in 1991 and 1992.

Ten years ago, New York businessman Eugene Lang promised scholarships to 61 East Harlem 6th graders graduating from elementary school, provided they stay in school. He guaranteed them a college opportunity. Most than 75 percent of these East Harlem youngsters to whom he made this promise were expected to be dropouts. For East Harlem as a whole, this statistic was real and remains pretty much the same today.

However, in stark contrast, more than 90 percent of Lang's kids, they are called dreamers, have already graduated from high school, and more than half are now attending college. He expects at least two-thirds of them eventually to get at least 2 years of higher education.

In 1986, 60 Minutes did a segment on Mr. Lang's program. Its most important message to the large viewing public that night was that this man's love, his caring for each of those dreamers made the important difference. It was not just the scholarships, it was the commitment he made to get to know each of those children, to stand behind them, to encourage and to help them along during their school years.

This incredibly busy international businessman and philanthropist developed over the years a personal relationship with these children that took a top priority in his life, just as if they were his own children.

I am sure that a lot of people who heard about Lang's efforts thought it was a wonderful or heroic thing, but some called him up and asked for help in setting up similar programs which they could start in their own cities. Thus, was born one of the first nationwide programs that focuses on our country's educational problems where they start, in elementary school, with the children who are left behind right from the beginning.

Today, there are 140 sponsors of "I Have a Dream" projects in 40 cities across the country, with nearly 10,000 dreamers. Some of the sponsors are millionaires like Gene Lang, but most are people of more modest means, like myself, who have committed themselves, along with many others from their churches or businesses or circles of friends, to the educational success of the dreamers.

Many of the successful "I Have a Dream" projects in cities like Chicago, Portland, New York, Dallas, Hartford and Fort Worth draw mentors from church congregations that have provided personal and financial resources to support the local sponsors and, similarly, from corporations like Enron in Houston, ADP in Patterson, Colgate in New York, and hundreds of others.

In Springfield, MA, the chairman of the Mass Mutual Life Insurance Company, Bill Clark, got his company to join another wonderful couple in a $300,000 funding commitment to fund a project, and Bill Clark, together with Diane Schroederman, sponsored an "I Have a Dream" project there. Among other things, each of the 52 Springfield dreamers have individual mentors who are employees of Mass Mutual. Bill Clark himself personally calls these folks every single week to insure that they are doing what they are supposed to be doing with their mentors and help support them, if they need it.

In Boston, I am the sponsor of our program. It consisted of 97 fourth graders when we initiated the dream in 1989, but grew to

111 as they became the fifth grade in 1990. We will raise most of our funds from the public. This is in part because I am from the "all name-no money" side of our family, and in part because I wanted to take the opportunity to reach out to the general public.

Through traditional fund raising means—you mentioned this dinner this January—we have made people in the Boston area, and continue to make them, aware that the program and other like it exist and that they can participate in this issue in a number of ways.

I mentioned mentoring. Mentoring, developing special personal relationships on a one-to-one basis, is an essential part of the "I Have a Dream" success. We in Boston have learned from other programs around the country that building strong relationships with parents is also critical. The combination of parental involvement and mentoring highlight what makes "I Have a Dream" different from many other programs which are funded or sponsored by the government or by any institution.

These two things, in addition to the personal commitment for from 6 to 12 years by the individual sponsors make our program the personal effort, rather than an institutional interference. Kids in our inner city schools need to feel the hand of love of a neighbor or a pastor or a mentor, from caring individuals who are friends, instead of the cold touch of institutional programs or the routine contact of caseworkers, psychologists or policemen. I got carried away a little bit with my rhetoric there.

The Boston business community has made our city an ideal place to start "I Have a Dream" projects. Through the ACCESS plan, all graduates of Boston public high schools are guaranteed last dollar college tuition assistance, so they can afford virtually any college they get into. So, ACCESS removes from us the burden of tuitions for our public school graduates. Probably 80, maybe 70 percent of our kids will graduate from the public schools, though they all are in public school now.

We "I Have a Dream" sponsors want to be sure that ACCESS is getting more graduates. Today, they have something along the lines of 150 to 200 out of 3,000 graduating members who apply for aid, and when you consider that 93 percent of my students, which are typical of Boston public schools, qualify for the Federal free lunch program, there is something wrong with that.

"I Have a Dream" sponsors in L.A. and New York, Chicago to Houston, and right here in Washington would love to see the Congress do less tinkering with systems and theories. We would love to see elected officials work together with the private and not-for-profit sectors to promote and support private sector initiatives in the inner city and public education.

We need to see millions of people volunteering their personal time, so kids hanging out on street corners will have a personal frame of reference, as they develop their consciences and moral values. These volunteers will come in from the suburbs, if they are led and if there is a supportive infrastructure which they can be a part of. Leadership and structure are critical, so these people are not overwhelmed by a false sense of constant danger in the inner city, and because they need to be supported by other people who

are doing the same things, sharing their joys and their frustrations.

My exposure to numerous "I Have a Dream" projects and their sponsors around the country and my own experience in Boston makes it clear that this program, created by Gene Lang and refined by years of inspirational experiences across the country, is an outstandingly effective model of public-private cooperation in dealing with a most critical and seemingly intractable national problem. Congress should study it carefully, and drawing on what I have heard this morning, you all should think about what we in the private sector out there in the real world are doing and what we might do, as well as what you can do in Washington.

This program takes advantage of existing resources in the community which do not currently reach most of the at-risk children out there. It is initiated by the private sector and, therefore, tends to be efficiently run and cost-effective. Average cost per year per dreamer is between $500 and $900, based on our class and several others in the country. These programs combine the carrot of college tuition with the supportive personal relationships that can make that carrot meaningful.

I believe it was that great republican Mao Tse Tung who said, "Give a man a fish and feed him for a day, teach a man to fish and feed him for a lifetime." As we seek to stop an reverse the destructive and costly cycles of welfare, we need self-appointed teachers, people who give of themselves by spending time with even one child on a regular basis, teaching them what they know about life, about right and wrong.

"I Have a Dream" is a great vehicle for those people to get onboard and I encourage you to examine it closely.

Thanks for your time.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Bush follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JAMES L. BUSH

Good Morning. Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today. I hope that my testimony will be of value as you consider your agenda for 1991.

Ten years ago New York Businessman Eugene Lang Promised 62 East Harlem 6th graders that he would provide last dollar college tuition aid. When he made that pledge, 75 percent of East Harlem public school students were expected to drop out of high school. for East Harlem as a whole, that statistic is virtually unchanged. In stark contrast, 95 percent of Lang's kids have graduated from high school—two-thirds have gone on to finish at least community college or vocational school.

In 1986, 60 Minutes did a segment on Lang's program. The most important thing imparted to the viewing public that Sunday night was that this one man's love, and his caring for each of those achildren, was what made the difference.

This incredibly busy, international businessman and philauthropist, developed, over a period of years, a personal relationship with these children which superseded all other issues in his life—just as if they were his own children.

I'm sure a lot of people who heard about Lang's efforts thought of them as heroic or miraculous but a few people called him up and asked him to help thenm put together a model which they could duplicate in their own city. There are now 140 sponsors of I Have A Dream programs in 40 cities across the country with nearly 10,000 students. First, many were millionaires like Gene Lang. Now they are increasingly people of more modest means like myself who have committed themselves along with manty others from their churches or businesses or circle of friends. Some of the most successful I Have A Dream mentor programs are in cities like Dallas, Fort Worth, and Hartford where members of churches of several different denominations have used their combined personal and financial resources to sponsor and fund programs. in Springfield, MA, the chairman of the Massachusetts

Mutual Life Insurance Company, Bill Clark, got his company to commit $150,000 and he, personally, has joined a wonderful couple from Springfield who have also committed $150,000 to sponsor an I Have A Dream progream there. About 48 of the 52 Dreamers there have mentors who are Massachusetts Mutual employees. Mr. Clark speaks with each mentor on a weekly basis to support them and/or to ensure that they are fulfilling their commitment to meet with their Dreamer weekly, on their own personal time.

In Boston, I am the sponsor of our program which consisted of 97 4th graders when we initiated the Dream in 1989 but grew to 111 as they became the fifth grade in 1990.

This is in part because I am from the "all name, no money" side of our family, and in part because I wanted to take the opportunity to reach out to the general public. Through traditional fund raising means, we have made people in the Boston area aware that the program, and others like it exist and that they can participate in any number of ways.

Mentoring—developing personal relationships on a one to one basis—is an essential part of the I Have A Dream success. We, in Boston, have learned from other programs around the country that building strong relationships with parents is also critical. The combination of parental involvement and mentoring highlight what makes I Have A Dream different from many other programs which are funded or sponsored by the Government or by any institution. These two things, in addition to the personal commitment, from from 6 to 12 years, by the individual sponsors make our programs a personal effort rather than in institutional interference. Kids in our inner city schools need to feel the hand of love of a neighbor, or a pastor, or a mentor/friend who may live outside of the city, instread of getting their sole form of personal attention from case workers, psychologists or policemen.

In fact, the Boston business community has made our city an ideal place to start I Have A Dream programs. Through the ACCESS Plan, all graduated of Boston Public High Schools are guaranteed last dollar college tuition assistance so they can afford virtually any college they get into. So ACCESS removes from us the burden of tuitions for our public school graduates.

I Have A Dream sponsors from Los Angeles to New Yriok, Chicago to Houston, and right here in Washington, would lve to see the Congress do less tinkering with systems and theories. We would love to see elected officials work together with the private and not-for-profit sectors to promote and support private sector initiatives in the inner city and public education.

We need to see thousands of people volunteering their time so kids hanging out on street corners will have a personal frame of reference as they develop their consciences and moral values. These volunteers will come in from the suburbs if they are led and if there is a supportive infrastructure which they can be a part of. Leadership and structure are critical so these people are not overwhelmed by a false sense of constant danger in the inner city, and because they need to be supported by other people who are doing the same things, sharing their joys and their frustrations.

I can say that in my exposure to numerous I Have A Dream programs and sponsors around the country and from my own experience with our own program, the I Have A Dream model, created by Gene Lang and refined by others as approipriate, is an outstanding focal point for you as yoiu consider what the Congress might do about these issues in 1991.

The program takes advantage of existing resources in the community which do not currently reach most of the at risk children out there. It is initiated by the private sector and therfore tends to be efficiently run and cost effective. (The average cost per year per Dreamer is between $500 and $900, based on our class and several others.) These programs combine the carrot of college tuition with the supportive personal relationships that can help make that carrot meaningful.

I believe it was that great republican Mao Tse-Tung who said "Give a man a fish and feed him for a day. Teach a man to fish and feed him for a lifetime." As we seek to stop and reverse the destructive and costly cycles of welfare, we need self appointed teachers—people who give of themselves by spending time with even one child on a regular basis, teaching them what they know about life—about right and wrong. I Have A Dream is a great vehicle for those teachers to get on board and I encourage you to examine it closely.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Dr. Finn.

Mr. FINN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. It is very nice to be back before this committee, perhaps the greatest kindness I could do you today is to be brief.

I am here to talk about higher education. You have got a long statement that I wrote. I am here both as a part of higher education and as what I like to think a friendly critic of it.

As I listened to Mr. Bush talk about the dreamers and to the students earlier this morning talk about the difficulty of getting to college and paying for it, and mindful of the considerable efforts that all of you are making to make college within reach of more people, it seems to me that once people get there, they ought to be getting something better than what a great many of the are encountering upon arrival, and I think that a whole set of quality issues in American higher education need a lot closer attention than they have been getting, even though criticism of higher education has been spreading rapidly, and in my statement I lay out 10 problems that I find particularly troublesome and worrisome in higher eduction.

Just to recap them very briefly, because they are all in the statement, the first is acquiring a college degree today is not necessarily proof of being well-educated. Partly because of weak preparation of elementary-secondary system, more and more colleges are providing what amounts to belated high school education to people after they get there.

My testimony has some data on this point. There is not a lot, because American higher education does not college very much outcomes data, and that is another problem.

Anecdotes abound, since sending the statement over to you. For example, a college mentioned having recently employed a young graduate of an ivy league institution and, in casual conversation the other day mentioning the Warren court to that young graduate of an ivy league institution, who gave him a blank stare and not having a clue what the Warren court is, was or might have been, because this was not something that college education had happened to get to.

My point here is that the products of our higher education system in a great many cases today are not well enough educated to be good citizens, let alone to meet the needs and expectations of employers and of the society.

My second concern is that a great many people are dropping by the wayside. The college dropout rate is greatly higher than the high school dropout rate. Of young people who entered 4-year colleges as fulltime students in 1980, only half of them had earned degrees 6 years later. And if you look at minority students in that population, only a quarter of the minority students had earned degrees 6 years later. This an enormously high wastage of human potential and of money, and is a darn shame, and we are not paying very much attention yet to the attrition rate.

Third, we have got low to nonexistent entry standards in college, and I am making this not as an elitist argument that people ought to be kept out. I am making it mostly because of the perverse effect that this has on the elementary-secondary schools, because the college entrance requirements constitute the de facto exit requirements of most of our high schools. And if the college signal clearly

that it really does not matter whether you learn much in school, most people are going to come to a rational decision and then not learn very much in school, and you get into a vicious circle, which I think we are in today.

A single example from New Jersey, which gives a basic skills readiness test to its entering State college students, they define the standard of verbal proficiency as what they call "being able to comprehend a relatively mature idea and develop it in standard English." Well, only 1 in 4 of the entering college students in New Jersey are meeting that rather modest standard in verbal readiness, even though they are already in college when this particular assessment is given to them.

Fourth, a point that has been much belabored in many places, so I will not say much about it, is that we have got what I am going to term a shabby and incoherent curriculum, in which many of our faculties have abdicated what I believe is their foremost responsibility, which is to decide what students are going to learn, and most of our colleges have dished up a grand smorgasbord, sometimes with a few rules for prospecting at it, but with very little sense that there are some things everybody ought to learn or anything that everybody ought to learn.

Fifth I term the "Beirut-ization" of higher education. We are rapidly becoming all pluribus and no unum, as our colleges and universities fragment themselves by race, by gender, by sexual orientation, into departments and living arrangements and social arrangements and eating arrangements, in which we are dividing our population or encouraging it to divide itself, rather than helping people to see what they have in common with each other.

I think this actually has a worsening effect on the episodes of racial and ethnic animosity that we are beginning to see on campuses, and I think that this bears attention, if we do not want to be like Beirut, if we do not want to be like Kashmir.

Sixth is the continuing erosion of freedom of speech and freedom of expression on campuses that ought to be its bastions, as more and more colleges come up with codes of what you can and cannot say, and as the ethos of what is called PC or political correctness spreads, such that people are intimidated from saying things that are not fashionable. Instead of seeking the truth through open inquiry, a number of campuses today are evolving a form of mandated expression, not only for students, but also even for faculty members.

Seventh, as I think you well know, it has gotten awfully expensive, both for the tuition payer and for the taxpayers.

Eighth, it is inefficient, unproductive and sometimes wasteful, which leads me to say that this enormous expensive is not always getting us our money's worth from these institutions. Facilities are underutilized, people are underutilized, people are working less and less, the school years and semesters and weeks are shortening, teaching loads are lightening, students who get degrees are taking more and more years to get them, and the number of nonteaching employees on campuses is soaring. Quality is all too often being confused with quantity or with lavishness, and we are not ending up with enough quality.

Ninth, I will term amorality on campus. I am speaking here as a parent, I should say, of two college students, so I have several perspectives on this matter. The colleges have almost completely abdicated their "in loco parentis" role, even for undergraduates in the traditional age group and, as a result, I think in part of that, we have widespread cheating, we have plagiarism, we have drug abuse, we have excessive drinking and we have a variety of other forms of behavior by 18- and 19- and 20-year-old students that I think the colleges ought to take more responsibility for than they are doing today.

Tenth and finally, we have weak to nonexistent quality control of the academy by the academy. Higher education wants to regulate itself in the spirit and tradition of academic freedom, and I agree with it, but it is doing a wretched job of that. Just look how badly the accreditation system works, for example, as a form of quality control, as a form of preventing abuse of students by unsavory institutions, waste of money, even loan default situations. that is just one example in the accreditation system. But the academy has not done a good job of policing itself is the short version.

Are these problems real, or is it all just sort of a bum rap for higher education? It is, after all, the world's most celebrated higher education system, and that it is, but it could be so much better than it is, if it would solve these problems or if we could help it or induce it to solve these problems.

In many case, there are not things the Federal Government can easily do about them, I think this is clear. I think calling attention to them would be a good way to start. I would hate to think that the higher education enterprise is going to end up in 5 or 10 or 20 years looking like the savings and loan enterprise looks today, and we will be asking ourselves 20 years from now why didn't we know this was happening while it was happening and why is digging ourselves out of this hole such a huge problem.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Finn follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF CHESTER E. FINN, JR.

Is American higher education losing the confidence and respect of the populace? Why are so many people complaining about it? How much substance do their criticisms have?

In approaching these questions, let me start with two familiar rituals. First, I acknowledge that the American higher education enterprise is the largest and finest on this planet. I believe I could prove that proposition, but I also know that most people already believe it. So permit me to spare a tree or two and simply say that I affirm it, too.

Second, I am keenly aware that American higher education is a marvelously diverse and variegated enterprise, boasting exceptions to every generalization that anyone might make about it. We all know this.

Having bowed before these two familiar idols, I shall now be both critical and general. Perhaps I overdo both.

I try here to establish a pair of propositions: first, that there has been a great deal of criticism of higher education in recent years, coming from many directions and dealing with a number of topics and issues; and, second, that much of that criticism is warranted, i.e. is grounded in authentic problems, dilemmas, excesses and shortcomings, not in mischievousness, ignorance, malevolence or fantasy.

My purpose is not to solve the particular problems that give rise to the criticism, nor even to analyze them at length. Doubtless I shall overstate some and fail to nuance others. I hope, however, to suggest that—for all its strengths—U.S. higher

education has a mega-problem compounded of those specific problems and of its failure thus far to solve them, sometimes even to acknowledge them. Though the mega-problem may be flamed in terms of image and reputation, I do not believe that its cure lies in the domain of public relations. Instead its solution, if there is to be one, lies in setting right the underlying conditions—and, of course, in making the public aware that this is occurring.

Let me first array some of the evidence that a number of people are not entirely pleased about what is going on within the ivy walls:

* In the recent round of national education goal-setting by the governors and President, higher education was conspicuous mainly for its absence. To the extent that it was discussed at the Charlottesville "Summit" and subsequently, a lot of governors were heard to say some pretty tart things about it, mainly along the lines of how greedy it is. Remarked Oregon's Neil Goldschmidt (a Democrat, incidentally, and an alumnus of Jimmy Carter's cabinet), "I don't know of any group that more [often] says in response to the questions about quality that the issue is money."

* A number of institutions, including some rather eminent ones, experienced a downturn in applications in 1990, interpreted by many as the beginning of authentic consumer resistance to the soaring prices of higher education (as well as continuing shrinkage of the "traditional" college-age population). 670 of 800 institutions surveyed by the National Association of College Admissions Counselors reported that, as of May 1, 1990, they still had openings for freshmen.

*The Justice Department probe of tuition-setting practices, faculty salaries and student aid policies in fifty-some leading colleges and universities has, to the astonishment of many in the academy, found a sizable fraction of the public cheering on the government, not siding with the institutions. This is faintly reminiscent of the Leona Helmsley tax evasion case in which the defendant proved so unlovable a figure that the public tended to favor the I.R.S.!

*Derek Bok devoted his latest annual report to the Harvard Overseers to a rather defensive (at least to me) response to the critics of higher education, something he presumably would not have done if he thought their criticisms could simply be sloughed off

*The number and variety of those critics is growing, too. It's not just Allan Bloom and Bill Bennett, though they're not to be underestimated. It's not just Profscam, either. It's also Lynne Cheney and Page Smith and James Allas and Roger Kimball. It's new organizations such as the National Association of Scholars and the Madison Center for Educational Affairs, with which I'm associated. Thoughtful and well-regarded columnists, such as Robert Samuelson, George Will, William Raspberry and Jonathan Yardley have lately emerged as strong, even acid critics of aspects of higher education. And in some places a tone of mockery—perhaps the least welcome criticism of all—has crept in, as in a recent Newsweek "conventional wisdom watch" item that suggested college presidents don't "cut the swath they once did" because "like politicians," they spend their days begging for money and covering their rears.

*The students seem cranky, too. Disgruntled undergraduates from 13 institutions have held two conferences at Syracuse devoted to figuring out ways to press their colleges to raise academic standards. Protests, demonstrations and building takeovers are back in fashion and, though these sometimes involve issues of high principle, often the grievances seem to be specific campus "outrages" ranging from soaring tuitions to apathetic faculty.

*As for the general public, in the 1989 poll conducted by Gallup for C.A.S.E., 44 percent of the sample gave the colleges honors grades for "overall performance" but 45 percent marked them "C" or lower! Just 37 percent conferred "A" or "B" on higher education for "making young people good citizens". And while few (22 percent) felt that a college education is worth less than the cost of attendance, only 39 percent indicated that it is worth more. (Most of the rest—35 percent in all—thought it about even.)

These may only be straws in the wind. I suggest, however, that they are to be taken seriously. Even Bok remarks of the present generation of criticism that "These harsh indictments have not been culled from fly-by-night journals or obscure newsletters. They have all appeared in mainstream publications reputable magazines, government reports, or books reviewed in respected periodicals."

What is the gist of the indictment? Let me first give you Bok's summary:

> [F]ar from praising our universities, critics in this country have attacked them more severely during the past 10 years than at any time in my memory. The tone of these complaints is often surprisingly bitter. Higher education has been termed "underaccountable and underproductive," in a "sickening tailspin" and "a national disgrace". Undergraduate education has been accused of "winding

down toward mediocrity" with a curriculum alternately described as "chaotic", a "disaster area", or "rotten to the core". Faculties too have had their fair share of criticism. According to one recent book, "The professors—working steadily and systematically—have destroyed the university as a center of learning and have desolated higher education, which no longer is higher or much of an education."

And here is how Robert J. Samuelson of Newsweek and the Washington Post characterized the "college charade" in June:

> [O]n the whole, our colleges are educationally undemanding and economically wasteful. They are a symptom of low educational standards—and a main cause. . . . Most colleges are obsessed with surviving. They subtly lower academic standards to ensure the flow of students and subsidies. . . . We are engaged in a costly charade. We pass out more and more degrees (including many graduate university degrees) with less and less meaning. The ultimate victims of this charade are our children. . . .

Let me now turn to my own list of what's wrong. It has 10 main elements.

1. Shaky cognitive outcomes among those who pass through the system. I'm referring here to four year undergraduate education, liberal arts, mainly, but parallels can be glimpsed in many professional fields at both the undergraduate and postgraduate levels.

The data are not great (indeed, a related failing of the academy is its inability, some would say unwillingness, to furnish reliable and intelligible measures of learning) but just consider a couple of batches. In 19851 the National Assessment of Educational Progress examined literacy levels among young (20–25 year old) adults and, within that population, it's possible to isolate those with substantial postsecondary education. When Audrey Pendleton of the U.S. Department of Education performed such an analysis, here is what she found:

> More than half of college upperclassmen and college graduates were unable to perform at the 350 level of the scales (emphasis hers).. . .Tasks characteristic of this level include stating in writing an argument made in a lengthy newspaper column, using a bus schedule to select the appropriate bus for given departures and arrivals, and calculating the amount of a tip in a restaurant given the percentage of the bill. While these tasks are at the upper levels of the literacy scales, the knowledge and skills required to complete them would generally not be considered college level. It is unclear whether the ability to perform these basic tasks is a prerequisite to higher-level skills needed in college. If they are, then it is questionable whether many college students have the foundation needed to pursue college-level studies.

Do not be lulled by the flat prose of a government report. These are young adults with at least two years of higher education under their belts of whom she speaks, and many are college graduates. Yet not even half of them function intellectually at the level described by Pendleton. The good news, as it were, is that those with less education fare even worse.

Another body of evidence comes from the National Endowment for the Humanities, which retained Gallup in 1989 to survey the history and literature knowledge of college seniors. Here, in the words of Endowment Chairman Lynne V. Cheney, is what they found:

> 25 percent of the Nation's college seniors [were] unable to locate Columbus's voyage within the correct half-century. About the same percentage could not distinguish Churchill's words from Stalin's, or Karl Marx's thoughts from the ideas of the U.S. Constitution. More than 40 percent could not identify when the Civil War occurred. Most could not identify Magna Carta, the Missouri Compromise, or Reconstruction. Most could not link major works by Plato, Dante, Shakespeare, and Milton with their authors. To the majority of college seniors, Jane Austen's Pride and Prejudice, Dostoyevsky's Crime and Punishment, and Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "Letter from the Birmingham Jail" were clearly unfamiliar.

On a smaller scale, in 1989 the chairman of the pathology department at Wake Forest University devised a 250 question exam based on' items in E.D. Hirsch's Dictionary of Cultural Literary. These were short "free response" answers, not multiple-choice items. Students were asked to "specifically identify each term with a short answer" or definition. Included were such terms as George Eliot, bas-relief, hypothalamus; Luftwaffe, Gang of Four, capital gain, Mount St. Helens, photoelectric effect and Sanskrit. The test was administered to 450 professional school students in Wake Forest's medical, law and business schools.

Nobody supposed that they would recognize all 250 terms. But even I was unprepared for results as weak as Dr. Robert Prichard and his colleagues report. The

overall average correct score was 24.7 percent. Business students fared worst, with an average of 17.2 percent. Law students were in the middle at 24.1 percent. The medical students led, but with a meager 28.4 percent.

This particular study, to my knowledge, has been repeated at just one other university. A colleague of Prichard's at the University of Kansas arranged to test 128 first year medical students at that institution. They did even worse than the Wake Forest students, earning an average score of 13.8 percent correct.

It will be said that a college education should equip people for more than the game of "Trivial Pursuit", and I know that some regard Hirsch's whole concept of "cultural literacy" as a flawed idea. Readers will form their own conclusions about the seriousness of this cognitive deficit among the graduates of American colleges. I think it's pretty shameful, myself.

2. Attrition during college. Only about half of those in the high school graduating class of 1980 who entered four year colleges on a full-time basis that same year wound up with bachelor's degrees within 6 years. (The figures are 48 percent in public colleges, 56 percent in private.) For black and Hispanic students, barely a quarter received their degrees during that 6-year period.

The situation is worse if we look for degrees earned within the traditional 4 years. According to the National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities, fewer than 15 percent of those entering 4-year institutions won their degrees in that period of time; within the independent sector, that figure rose to an unimpressive one student in four. By semester 12, more had quit college than had won degrees.

This is far higher than the much-lamented high school dropout rate. It suggests that something is gravely awry, either with the recruitment and admissions process or with what students find after they matriculate. Either people are being admitted recruited—who lack the motivation and intellectual readiness for college, or once they arrive they are left to flounder on their own. Most likely both. Several studies of colleges, including the latest Carnegie report, suggest that poor advising, heedless faculty and the general anomie of college life, combined with a lack of feedback and academic assistance, contribute to a pretty unsatisfactory experience. I don't suggest that every single person who decides to put his toe in the college pond should be expected to swim to the other side. But I do say that too many are drowning along the way.

3. Low to non-existent entrance standards. This is obviously related to the previous two concerns. Even as a few colleges grow ever more selective there are hundreds of others that come close to admitting everyone who can breathe and write a check. (And, in some well-regarded private institutions, the check-writing seems to be getting more important, as "need-blind" admissions policies bite the dust.) I'm not making an elitist argument that only intellectual superstars should be allowed into postsecondary education. But we need to pay attention to the proliferation of remedial instruction on campus and to the huge percentages of entering students ho need it—and to nobody knows how many more who need it but either the college doesn't have it or doesn't ascertain who needs it.

On the 1989 Carnegie survey of faculty members, about 75 percent of full time professors felt that their students were seriously underprepared in terms of basic skills. And when the Southern Regional Education Board surveyed its members in 1986, 60 percent of responding institutions reported that at least 30 percent of their entering freshmen needed such assistance; on almost three campuses in ten, more than half the freshmen arrived in that condition.

New Jersey administers a basic skills test io all entering students in its State colleges and universities. One purpose is to assist the institutions in placing students into needed remedial courses. On the tests given in the autumn of 1989, just 24 percent of New Jersey's freshmen "appeared proficient" in verbal skills, 31 percent in math computation and 14 percent in elementary algebra. All the rest—these are matriculating college students, mind you—either "lacked proficiency"or were proficient only in "some areas" of the subject.

The standards were not terribly onerous, either. To be judged proficient in verbal skills on the State test, for example, meant being able to "comprehend a relatively mature idea and develop it in standard English". Lots of entering students could not do this and therefore were headed for remediation in the Garden State, but that's not the only place. I'm told by a professor at Middle Tennessee State University, for example, that the fastest-growing department at his institution over the past decade has been the euphemistically named "Department of Developmental Studies", now up to 51 faculty members.

Remediation is costly and wasteful, but it is no sin. The really wicked consequence of slack postsecondary entry standards is, of course, the devastating effect these have on secondary school exit standards. As Albert Shanker says, "Adoles-

cents are like adults. They do as much as they have to in order to get what they want. The young people who want to go to elite [institutions] . . .must meet high standards, and they work hard but the rest of high school students know they can get into some college no matter how poorly they do."

A vicious circle arises, in which students do liNe work in school, the schools weaken, reform efforts falter despite much talk of "excellence", and then the colleges wind up with underprepared students, whom they must then remediate. To the extent that remedial education consumer institutional resources and student time that would otherwise have gone for bona fide "higher" education, half these same students emerge from college (if they stick it out) without having learned enough to figure out a bus schedule.

Though a handful of major state institutions—Ohio, Tennessee and the University of California come to mind—have in recent years toughened their entrance norms, the present applicant dearth is having just the opposite efiect on other campuses. "Several institutions have reached deeper than usual into their waiting lists to enroll enough students," the Chronicle reported in mid-June, "while others have lowered their admissions standards. Indeed, high-school counselors report that many colleges and universities are admitting students who probably wouldn't have even been placed on their waiting lists a few years ago." Ouoth one such counselor (who is also the former admissions director at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst), "Kids would come into my office and announce that they had been admitted, and the first few times I almost fell off of my chair. In the six years I've been director of college counseling here, it was the weakest class we've had academically. But we've had the best college-admissions results we've ever had."

The contemporary admissions game also saps some of what I will rashly term the dignity of higher education, as marketting strategies for a number of institutions come to resemble those of resort hotels. A dorm at Southwest Missouri State was described in the Chronicle as boasting microwaves and computers in each suite, tanning beds, a convenience store and room service. And, says the housing administrator of a Florida university, "They want cable. If there's no MTV, the room is hardly rentable."

Doubtless that's an honest rendering of his experience. But what does it say about institutional priorities? And if marketting strategies come to look like this from the vendor's side, it is not to be doubted that consumer information sources are going to proliferate, from the hated U.S. News rankings to a multitude of increasingly specialized and critical guidebooks, handbooks and reviews. If colleges hawk their wares like car dealers, it must be expected that students and parents will in time don the attitudes and mindsets' of auto customers when they go comparison shopping among colleges. This describes a relationship that doesn't contain much trust, and that is certainly susceptible to abuses on all sides.

Consider an ad I spotted not long ago in the free airline magazine awaiting me in the seat pocket:

California Coast University's home study programs can help you earn a recognized Bachelors, Masters, or Doctoral degree without mandatory classroom or seminar attendance requirements. Students may receive additional academic credit towards their degree for work experience, specialized training, military schools, seminars professional, vocational training, and credentials. Degree programs were developed with the busy professional in mind. Register and enroll at any time, complete any remaining requirements as rapidly as your time and ability permit, at home, or while traveling. Many of our graduates have completed their programs in 9 to 12 months.

The small print at the bottom noted that this dubious academic enterprise has "full institutional approval from the State of California Department of Education". (And I think we can assume that its students are eligible for federal grants and loans.) I do not know whether California Coast U. is a "proprietary" institution or not; I suppose it is. But the higher education community deluded itself if it thinks the public is comforted or reassured by this distinction. Proprietrries are not the only places where one can get degree credit for non-academic activities. "No one knows for sure how many colleges ofier older students credit for life experiences", the Chronicle reported in April, "but most estimate the number at between 700 and 1000." At Barry University, where the most popular 'major is the "bachelor of professional studies", students can receive up to sixty credits for "life experience".

4. The shabby, incoherent curriculum that characterizes much of contemporary higher education is an issue that goes way beyond credit for "life experience". This criticism has come from many directions and critics, from the Association of American Colleges (AAC) to Bill Bennett to Lynne Cheney, from Allan Bloom to Ernie Boyer to the recent book by Page Smith. They are all saying that on too many cam-

puses the curriculum remains largely a smorgasbord in which you don't have to learn anything in particular, in which few things you may want to study have prerequisites and there is liNe sense of accumulation of knowledge or progression of intellect, and in which the faculty has largely abdicated its single most fundamental responsibility, which is to decide what students ought to learn.

Why this is so is open to multiple explanations. I tend to ascribe it to the loss of institutional authority—not just in higher education—that we associate with the late sixties and early seventies, plus the marketting dynamics dictated by providing whatever students want to take, plus the fragmentation of many academic disciplines, plus a bit of academic feather-bedding, plus the well-known fact of group dynamics that in a situation such as a faculty curriculum conimittee it is easier to say yes to everyone who feels strongly than to make hard choices among one's peers and their specialties.

Some recent data on the matter come from Robert Zemsky, a respected (and, to my knowledge, non-ideological) scholar at Penn, whose study of 25,000 college student transcripts, as reported in the Chronicle, discovered that the liberal arts curriculum is "fragmented". "We find the undergraduate curriculum in the liberal arts lacking in sufficient breadth of study," Zemsky said, "particularly in the natural sciences and mathematics, and lacking in substantial depth."

Lynne Cheney makes the straightforward point that one reason college seniors don't know a lot of basic things is because they're not obliged to study them. According to NEH survey data, one could graduate in 1989 from 78 percent of the nation's colleges without taking any course in the history of western civilization, from 38 percent without taking any course in history at all, and from 45 percent without taking any course in American or English literature.

One reason the curriculum is so flabby is that firm requirements run afoul of shrewd institutional marketing strategies. Two thirds of all bachelor's degrees awarded today are in professional fields, not liberal arts. Students often want to study only that which they find germane to their intended postollege plans. Campus requirements that get in the way of that preference may mean fewer students.

But I have a hunch that the flight from liberal arts has to do not only with Yuppie-style career-obsessed vocationalism. It may also have something to do with not finding in today's libe'ral arts enough that's rewarding amid what Page Smith labels the "social nonsciences" and the "inhuman humanities". One may enjoy literature, for example, but how many students get any real satisfaction from deconstructionist analysis? One may relish history, but think how much it loses when its grand epic dramas are overtaken by quantitative analyses and worm's eye views of tiny little questions.

The very proliferation of course offerings, and the inability of most faculties to decide what is more important than what, may well also contribute to the exodus of students from the arts and sciences.

I believe that it's the responsibility of the college to determine what skills and knowledge students should possess and then see that they acquire these. I don't mean every item should be prescribed. But an undergraduate education ought to be more than a cafeteria where people wander in and nibble at whatever they like. Eighteen and nineteen year olds—and even a fair number of 28 and 39 year olds aren't necessarily the best judges of what they should study or how well they've learned it. It seems to me that's what faculties are for.

5. Something new and worrisome is beginning to be visible within the smorgasbord, not just on the instructional side of the institution but also in its patterns of academic and social organization. I think of it as the Beirutization of higher education.

White student "unions" have lately sprung up in half a dozen universities. "Men's studies" programs are spreading, too, as this new "field" gains academic legitimacy and adherents. On two Massachusetts campuses, students held "straight pride" rallies last spring.

These are recent developments, but the pattern is familiar. Many institutions of higher education already boast departments of Women's Studies, Chicago Studies, Native-American Studies, Black (now "Afro-American") Studies, and sometimes Gay Studies, not to mention clubs and associations for every imaginable racial, ethnic, cultural and political subgroup or sexual preference, as well as college-sponsored centers, dorms and dining arrangements organized along similar lines.

The lines are the problem. These are lines that divide, not ties that bind, the "pluribus" in American society rather than the "unum". That such lines crisss the land is given. The question is whether our educational institutions should etch them deeper.

Scanning the globe, we can see plenty of societies in which such lines have turned into crevasses, places where people identify primarily with their own demographic or religious faction and look at others in terms of group identity rather than individual charactenstics. Today these include Lebanon and Iran, Kashinir and the Punjab, Azerbaijan and Armenia, Northern Ireland and Sri Lanka. South Africa, too, of course, and myriad other African lands where tribalism is strong.

The sentiment most conspicuous in these places is inter-group hatred. The politics most evident are those of subjugation, secession and disintegration. Quite a lot of killing goes on, too, slaughters whose most notable characteristic is that killer and victim belong to different groups. Individual merit and accomplishment take a backseat in these places. So do neutral institutions and broad principles such as equality, tolerance, color-blindness and due process. Those are modem, essentially artificial contrivances, fragile and weak against the forces of fundamentalism, tribalism, prejudice, and guns.

Few Americans want such a future for the United States. One has to wonder, then, why so many of our educational institutions are pandering to tendencies that point in that direction, not just allowing but actively encouraging students (and faculty) to identify—and spend their time associating—with the ascriptive sub-groups to which they already belong. It seems especially ironic inasmuch as the most vexing problem on many a campus is inter-group tension.

At least some of this tension arises from resentment of the special treatment already enjoyed by favored groups. Obtaining status, attention, privileges, resources and various other advantages in the academic context is now associated with getting one's group identified as victims, either of generalized societal oppression or of inequities generated by benefits previously conferred on other groups. The "academic spoils system", George Will calls it "Much of the political clout that black students on predominanlly white campuses are able to wield", notes columnist William Raspberry, "comes from painting themselves as victims" Yet, "in order to sustain itself", he perceptively adds, "that power requires that the victims go on celebrating their victimization, and it encourages other groups—women, ethnics, gays, even heterosexual white males—to establish themselves as victims as a means to countervailing political power. The result is to undermine the sense of community on campus".

Others are noting—and lamenting—the same pattern. "The deep social divisions that all too often divide campuses racially and ethnically undermine the integrity of higher education", reports the recent Carnegie Campus Life study.

With racial and anti-Semitic episodes spreading on many campuses, and with reports that minority students are beginning to make their college choices so as to minimize the odds of encountering such unpleasantness, one might think this a time to build bridges, to work on the "unum", to encourage students to gaze upon the world through color- and gender-blind eyes, to regard each other as individuals rather than group representatives and, in the curriculum, to stress that which people have in common rather than that which makes them different.

Yet matters seem to be careening in the other direction, not only in the colleges but also in the primary and secondary schools, where every trend in higher education eventually echoes.

What we are seeing, I believe, is deep confusion among educators over the meaning of "pluralism" and "multiculturalism". These can lead either to separatism or to unity. It is a non-trivial distinction. The former is the path to Beirut, the latter the road to the Peaceable Kingdom.

Ironically, "multiculturalism" seems to be emerging as another rationale for the curricular smorgasbord. "Who are we to 'impose' our cultural preferences on anyone via course requirements?" The problem is that students, left to make such decisions for themselves in an atmosphere that celebrates group differences and encourages separatism, are apt to spend their time within the comfortable surroundings of their own group and to thumb their noses—or worse—at others. This situation intersects in vexing ways with the vendetta against western culture and "Eurocentric" curricula that is so large a part of what passes for campus discourse today. "Very little agitates academia more these days," historian Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. recently wrote, "than the demands of passionate minorities for revision ofthe curriculum: in history, the denunciation of Western civilization courses as cultural imperialism; in literature, the denunciation of the 'canon', the list of essential books, as an instrumentality of the existing power structure."

The big core curriculum debate at Stanford was only the most celebrated instance. The "book wars", as James Atlas calls them, are being waged all over the land. "America is foundering," he writes, "because Americans no longer get a proper education. In their attempts to redress injustice, the radicals of the 1960s un-

wittingly perpetuate it: the assault on the curriculum has undermined the foundation of learning on which our society rests."

6. Despite the celebration of pluralism on campus, we also encounter evidence that free inquiry, untrammeled discussion and openmindedness are in trouble; that many disciplines and departments are politicized; that contrary views are unwelcome, either as colleagues or as guest speakers; and that students who do not hew to the dominant political ethos may not be very welcome either. The First Amendment is in some jeopardy, too, as a number of campuses attempt to respond to things like scurrilous graffiti and racist talk with bans on speech and behavior, at least one of which has already rvn afoul of the federal courts.

It's important to note that, unlike the McCarthy era of the fifties when academic freedom was menaced by external forces in the society, this is something that higher education is doing to itself, whether because of its own bizarre sense of "principle" or because institutions are capitulating to student (and faculty) factions and offampus pressure groups. Though Wellesley did not succumb to students aggrieved by the prospect that Barbara Bush would be their commencement speaker, Northern Colorado and Rutgers both withdrew their invitations to Linda Chavez to speak after students and faculty members protested. "Much of the pressure on the two institutions", reported the Washington Times, "appears to have come from the League of United Latin American Citizens. The group has long opposed her for her stands on English, bilingual education and affirmative action." The "academy has become an ideological foxhole", editorialized the Wall Street Journal. "The Supreme Soviet may be full of debate these days, but in Greeley everyone agrees."

It has, of course, been said by many that the campus is the last bastion of sixties-style radicalism in American society. The point is developed at some length by Roger Kimball in his thoughtful book, Tenured Radicals. Recall that one of the great failings of sixties-style radicalism was its intolerance, particularly of traditional values, of patriotism, democracy and capitalism. The American public, it seems to me, wants from its higher education institutions not jingoism or cheerleading or indoctrination, but open-mindedness, balance, diversity of views, tolerance and free inquiry. It isn't always finding that today.

This is a criticism often voiced by political conservatives—a number of whom have now fled to "think tanks" to escape what they take to be the hostile atmosphere of the university campus. Certainly we have heard these concerns from the likes of Kimball and Bloom. But it would be a mistake to think it is confined to the right. Let me return to Page Smith, historian, longtime college professor, founding provost of the University of California at Santa Cruz, and by his own description a man of the left. "Academic fundamentalism is the issue", Smith writes, "the stubborn refusal of the academy to acknowledge any truth that does not conform to professorial dogmas. In the famous 'marketplace of ideas', where all ideas are equal and where there must be no 'value judgments' and therefor no values, certain ideas are simply excluded, and woe to those who espouse them. Such individuals are terminated, lest their corruption spread to others."

A special issue in 1990, it seems to me, is the democratic revolution sweeping the world, and how our colleges and universities are responding, both in their formal curricula and in terms of the values and attitudes they convey. I've heard it said that at a time when the values of the American political system are being sought and emulated—and sometimes being killed for—from Beijing to Budapest, from Rumania to Nicaragua; our own educational institutions are not doing a very good job of imparting those values to our own young people, either because many of those doing the teaching are ambivalent about the political values of which I speak or, more simply, because the formal and informal curricula of our colleges are largely oblivious to such things. They may well even be hostile. Marxism is in retreat everywhere on the planet, it seems, save on the campuses of universities located in democracies.

7. It's too bloody expensive. Current fund expenditures per full-time student (excluding capital outlays) averaged $11,122 in public institutions in 1988 and $18,896 on private campuses. As we all know, these figures have been rising much faster than inflation. Real higher education expenditures per student rose 27 percent during the 1980's. Yes, there are reasons, most of them elucidated with great sophistication by Arthur Hauptman and others. At least there are explanations. But I do not believe they are very persuasive any more except to those within the academy itself. There have been too few efforts at cost control, too bland an acceptance of the "inevitability" of it all, too little insistence on efficiency and productivity gains, hence too heavy a burden on those who must pay, be they taxpayers via the legislature or parents and other tuition payers.

Cost/price escalation is no longer amusing, especially now that the "Chivas Regal" strategy has been unmasked. Governors are quicker now to block their state institutions from raising tuitions. Private college leaders are beset with anxiety. Thomas Kean, the respected former governor of New Jersey, now president of Drew University, recently wrote that "When both college students and Justice Department lawyers ask the same questions about the price and value of higher education—and about the priorities of college administrators—we had better be concerned" (emphasis his).

Private giving is not as easy nowadays as it once was, either, and some of the difficulty beginning to be encountered appears to stem from mounting doubts among prospective donors about the innate worthiness of the enterprise. A dean I know at a distinguished university says that wealthy donors are less willing to accept his institution's assurances about what constitutes scholarship, more disposed to restrict their gifts, to insist on seeing just what they will get for their money, to specify what it can be spent for. The large point here is the erosion of the traditional sense that the university knows best.

8. A related point is the lack of efficiency and productivity on campus. I will not soon forget the strong impression I received while visiting about two dozen well-regarded colleges with my (then-high school senior) children in the summers of 1987 and 1988: nobody (save for admissions office personnel) was visible on campus in July. Those elaborate physical plants were mostly idle. Those well-equipped libraries had nobody reading in them. The faculty was nowhere in sight.

We also know that students and professors are doing less work than they used to and taking longer to accomplish the same amount. Many undergraduates now spend five or six (or more) years getting their degrees. The Carnegie Foundation reports that tenured faculty members now teach just eight hours a week, on average, and far less than that in elite research institutions. Semesters are getting shorter and so are weeks. Saturday classes have long since vanished; Friday classes are going fast. Thursday night has become a party night, with keg parties on campus and crowds of students in the town pubs. There is anecdotal evidence that students and faculty members are tacitly conspiring to cram many courses into a Tuesday-Thursday pattern so as to permit all of them four day weekends. This is all a bit out of synch with the rest of society, where we see evidence that work-weeks are lengthening again and leisure time diminishing.

Teaching less is regarded as a worthy accomplishment. Page Smith recounts this anecdote: "I recently encountered a professor I know. To my query as to how she was, she replied enthusiastically: 'Wonderful. I'm not teaching this quarter.' And her husband (also a professor)? Even better. He had been on leave all last year d was, at that very mom,ent, writing an application for a grant that would relieve him of all teaching duties for the next year.

More and more instruction is being handled by part-timers and so-called "gypsy" faculty. Meanwhile, we see vast growth in non-teaching administrators and staff. The Chronicle looked into this, using EEOC data, and reported that, between 1975 and 1985, a decade in which faculty ranks grew by 6 percent and service and maintenance personnel shrank by 5 percent, the number of executive, administrative and managerial employees rose 18 percent and the number of scalled "other professionals" went up an amazing 61 percent.

I don't say these people are idle or that they're not eaming their pay. But what does this say about institutional priorities, and about how the academy views change? Here we encounter what Rodman Drake, head of Cresap, the management consulting firm, calls the confusion of quality with quantity. In a paper he presented to a higher education symposium in 1989, he said that

Too often colleges treat quality like an abstract ideal, unconnected to real world concerns. Pursuing that ideal, ironically, becomes a matter of sheer quantity. Quality is taken simply to mean more—more faculty, more publishing output from that faculty, more books in the library, more sophisticated machines in the labs, no matter how expensive or how little used. Our so-called quality-driven institutions are characterized by the escalating costs of new buildings, new departments, new course offerings and greater specialization, all layered onto existing programs. This addn spiral is exacerbated by cost-plus pricing in which budgets are set by an institution's wish list and financed through higher tuition charges and increasingly ambitious fund-raising drives—tactics that only intensify the cost-quality dilemma.

A common response from the academy is that non-profit institutions shouldn't be expected to show productivity gains. To which almost everyone outside the academy says balderdash. But, in faimess, let me note that some in higher education are changing their tune. Stanford's vice president for finance, William F. Massey, in a pair of excellent papers on productivity improvement strategies for colleges and uni-

versities, described what he termed "sell-destructive" forces in terms of the productivity of academic institutions and went on to ,nake a series of practical suggestions for enhanced efficiency. To break the present cycle, he wrote, we must "end cost-plus pricing and place strict limits on spending growth; in effect, simulating the discipline of the marketplace", and "establish planning and resource allocation processes and incentives designed to enable innovation and stimulate growth by substitution—that is, reallocation from areas of lower to areas of higher academic potential and productivity.. . .We must simultaneously enforce spending constraints and make sure that our governance and management processes can generate productivity improvement to fund needed innovation".

As if to make a symbolic down payrnent on that pledge, Stanford, joined by Dartmouth, recenlly announced that it is putting its central administrative staff onto a sort of organizational diet. Lehigh has made similar noises. Several institutions have scrapped whole schools and departments as part of a policy of "selective excellence". This, of course, is an enormously painful thing to do, and risks damage to muscle and bone as well as the elimination of flab. But the risks of continued gorging are at least as grave.

9. I do not believe I am the only person (or parent) troubled by amorality on the campus, by drinking, drugs, sex, plagiarism and cheating, too much of all these among students, t5o0 little supervision by the institutions, too quick an abandonment of their "in loco parentis" role, ometimes by their failure even to enforce state and federal laws, let alone to instill moral and ethical behavior in their students. A recent survey of undergraduates at Miami University in Ohio found 91 percent of them admitting to having engaged in academic plagiarism. A national survey reports that 30 percent of students say they have plagiarized within the past year.

John Silber's move to tighten up behavior in the BU dorms was manifestly unpopular with his students but I think it was much-admired around the country. No one supposes that people in their late teens and twenties will spontaneously be chaste and sober and unfailingly honorable and respectful of one another. The falling here is with the institutions for allowing the social norms and living arrangements on so many campuses to become so lax.

10. Finally, we have seen years of weak to nonexistent quality control of and by the higher education community concerning all the matters I have been recounting. (That list could be extended, too. I have not said a word about the various corruptions that come with big-time varsity sports, for example, about fund-raising via in Washington and state capitals, about what Page Smith calls the "meretriciousness of most academic research", or about the spotty quality of undergraduate teaching and the screwy campus value system that pays so little attention to good teaching in meting out status and reward among faculty members.) Accreditation hasn't done the job, nor have the various higher education associations, nor has anything else. I suspect that the higher education enterprise today simply does not have the structures and mechanisms that will be required for effective self-policing.

The academy demands from the society independence and self-governance for itself, but it hasn't disciplined itself to an adequate degree. Which means it is not so surprising when state and federal officials intervene, whether on loan defaults or tuition-setting policies or the tax treatment of university-owned businesses. Still more intervention may follow. So thinks George Washington University president Stephen I. Trachtenberg who said in a recent speech that American schools of higher education are at the point today . . . that the nation's savings and loan associations were at in the later 1980's. What they are doing . . . how they are doing it . . . and how they propose to go on doing it isn't viable, can't last and, within a few years, is going to bring about the very thing academicians most fear, which is the kind of 'outside intervention that has little use for traditional academic values and practices.

It's easy to lament weak or non-existent "leadership" in any enterprise, but I do think this is an authentic problem for higher education today. Whether it is because they are endlessly engaged in fire-fighting and fund-raising, or because they don t have that much to say about important matters, or because they arc wary of saying things that are not "politically correct", most of today's college and university presidents are lying very low when it comes to the big issues facing higher education. U.S. News recently speculated that they "fear that taking a stance on controversial issues will alienate potential donors". Perhaps that's so. I'm inclined to a more depressing explanation, namely that many of the putative leaders" of American higher education do not believe that the kinds of problems I've been describing are real or serious.

A lot of denial is going on, and much of it is voiced with greater force than the more timorous admission of shortcomings. Though Derek Bok's recent report, for ex-

ample, admitted that some recent criticism is "undoubtedly deserved", I think the Boston Globe caught his dominant message when it termed the report a "sweeping defense of American higher education". Nor is Bok alone. The president of Colorado College recently penned a spirited paean to high tuitions for the Christian Science Monitor. The head of Spring Kill College wrote in the Atlanta Journal & Constitution this spring that "students are getting their money's worth". I could go on, citing examples of defensiveness, denial and self-praise from academic leaders.

Perhaps this is a predictable response to widening criticism, mostly from off-campus. The question it suggests, however, is whether American higher education in general is ready to concede that some significant portion of the problems I've been laying out are real, or whether it thinks there's not much more here than inaduate public relations built on a bum rap.

Some plainly believe that the steak is fine, the cooks are swell, the recipe is sound and the nly problem is that the platter doesn't sizzle quite enough when served to its fussy customers. Others—not so numerous—seem to agree that the sizzle is the least of what's wrong, that higher education needs to attend to the quality of the meat and the soundness of the kitchen, even if only out of a keen concern for its own self interest.

Obviously I think the problems are real. I don't expect them to prove easy to solve. But there a sizable reservoir of good will and confidence among the American people vis-a-vis higher is education. It is something that people still value and want for themselves, their children, and their grandchildren. Higher education is not, like the solid waste disposal industry or the advertising industry or the pesticide industry, a necessary evil, something that we're stuck with but don't much like. It is something we are disposed to think well of.

Thanks to this basic goodwill, higher education doesn't have to pull any rabbits out of hats, doesn't have to get its problems solved overnight. The American public will be patient. But it needs some evidence of movement in the right direction, some indication that the problems are honestly acknowledged and that efforts to solve them are commencing.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Albright.

Mr. ALBRIGHT. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and members of this distinguished committee.

I am awfully inclined to begin my conversation with you this afternoon by taking issue with many of the points of my good friend Chester Finn, but that would not allow me to present my own agenda, so I will simply indicate to you at the outset that I agree with some of the issues that he has addressed with respect to higher education, but I am delighted that he eventually came to the end of his presentation by saying higher education in America is still celebrated, for indeed it is.

I should tell you that I have had the great opportunity, as president of Johnson C. Smith, to travel abroad and see higher educational systems in a variety of countries, just having returned from Japan, where I conducted an assessment of higher education in that Nation. And while we do have problems, and indeed serious problems, which must be addressed by thee Congress and perhaps, even more importantly, by higher education, I am not quite as pessimistic about the State of higher education as my good friend Chester Finn, and I believe that this Congress, in conjunction with American higher education, can help to restore the imminence which we have enjoyed for many, many years.

I have been asked to speak about the conditions of postsecondary education and, as the president of a small private relatively poor historically black college, I want to assure you, Mr. Chairman, I understand really well the virtues of being brief and to the point. Therefore, I want to suggest to you what I consider to be some of the challenges facing higher education, and then close by suggest-

ing to you some of the issues that I hope this Congress will address, as you consider the reauthorization of higher education.

We are a unique industry, because we are diverse, because we have a commitment to public service, research and teaching. Our problems are, as follows, I believe: One, as Chester has mentioned so very well, diminishing public confidence in the quality and integrity of higher education. Second, I am very much concerned, as are many of my colleagues, that the spiraling costs of higher education threaten the financial viability of many of the Nation's smaller colleges, indeed, colleges which have contributed much to the Nation, and, indeed, threaten the capacity of many students, particularly low-income and middle-income students from attending college.

Third, many of my colleagues and I are very much concerned about the graying of the professorate, and, indeed, it is very difficult for us to encourage and, indeed, compel more of our best and brightest students to enter a career in teaching. I think this portends serious consequences for the Nation, in the sense of our ability to continue to sustain the high quality and the diversity for academic programs.

Fourth, many of our institutions of higher education, including a host of our finest and largest institutions, have aged facilities and suffer from very serious deferred maintenance programs. As a consequence, in my view, we are not able to accommodate, as we should, all of the students who seek higher education, and especially in the highly technological and scientific oriented areas. We are no longer able to conduct research and teaching activities on the very cutting edge of those disciplines, disciplines which will be terribly important to the Nation in the year 2000 and beyond.

Fifth, it strikes me that scarce resources have occasioned us in higher education to cut faculties and programs which I believe will be not only necessary, but imperative as we move rapidly into a world community which daily grows increasingly interdependent. I think it is especially true in the areas of foreign language study, international relations, and international education. And as Senator Simon has pointed out, I was struck by the notion that in Japan, every elementary and secondary school student spends 6 years studying English, and that even the most unlettered students and people in that country are far more multilingual than we are in this Nation.

I think it is important for us, in our own sense of national defense and world peace, to stress the importance of international study and foreign languages. As Chester has pointed out, increasingly, many of the students who come to our campuses have significant educational deficits which oftentimes occasions us in higher education to spend an ever-larger proportion of our resources on developmental education.

Finally, among the many other problems my colleagues might cite, I want to suggest to you members of this very distinguished committee that, quite frankly, we are losing the battle, in my view, to promote the genuine equality of educational opportunity for the ever-increasing number of minority and low-income citizens of our Nation.

It is a national tragedy, ladies and gentlemen, that as we approach the phenomenon of the year of one-third of the Nation, the year 2000, in which 1 out of every 3 Americans will be a minority, that we have today almost as many black males in the prisons of the United States as we have on college campuses, or that last year in this Nation we produced less than 800 Ph.D.'s for black Americans, or that each year we have an increasing number of minority students graduating from the high schools of our campus, and yet the number and percentage of minority students entering postsecondary education has been relatively flat since 1976.

In my view, if this Nation is to overcome the national challenges we face as we approach the year 2000, we must appropriately nurture and harvest what my distinguished friend and colleague, Dr. Norman Francis, occasionally refers to or describes as our last national resource, the minority students of this Nation.

Against that backdrop, what are some of the issues that this Congress I hope will consider with respect to——

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Albright, I know Mr. Bush—you have got a 1:00 o'clock plane, if you want to excuse yourself. If you could, I have just one——

Mr. BUSH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. [continuing] What are the services, besides education, that you find the students need the most?

Mr. BUSH. Inner city elementary and middle school kids?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BUSH. It is hard to just say the services. What I did say in my prepared remarks is accurate, and basically they need the love and caring of an individual who is going to stand up and be an advocate and a friend, an advocate with a circle of things that are out there, from municipal services to recreation to cultural and artistic things, to counseling, if they need counseling. If 60 percent of our kids last year were diagnosed in 5th grade as suffering from depression, they need all kind of things, but they do not necessarily need psychological counseling. It is sort of a broad question.

The CHAIRMAN. OK. I am sorry to interrupt you. If there are panel members that want to, we might impose on you. There is also a flight at 1:15 Eastern, 2:00 Northwest and 2:15 American.

Mr. BUSH. If you want me to stick around, I will take the Eastern plane. I will leave.

The CHAIRMAN. OK.

Mr. BUSH. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Dr. Albright.

Mr. ALBRIGHT. Thank you, Senator. I will be brief. I am concluding.

I want to urge this Congress, as you consider reauthorization of the higher education amendments, to consider the following issues:

One, support the strengthening of international studies and research and expand the teaching and study of foreign languages in our public schools, our colleges and our universities. I believe that it is increasingly important for us to make sure that all of our students and citizens understand the importance and the significance of living in world which grows smaller.

Second, I urge this Congress to expand Federal support for undergraduate research, for graduate student assistanceships and for faculty research. Clearly, in my view, we are losing the war with respect to the revitalization of our economy, and we need to make sure that we can indeed produce the young scientists and scholars and researchers who can help to revitalize the American economy.

Third, in my view, I hope this Congress will initiate programs, including designated scholarship support, to add to the supply of teachers at all levels of the educational system, and especially in the scientific, quantitative and technological areas, where the shortage of qualified teachers is most acute.

Fourth, I hope that this Congress will support the construction and renovation of research and teaching facilities through a program of matching Federal grants and low-interest loans by agencies whose mission includes research support.

Fifth, I urge this Congress to implement existing legislative authority to help colleges and universities obtain access to capital markets for construction, renovation and equipment of facilities.

Sixth, perhaps most important, to genuinely remove the barriers which threaten the equality of educational opportunity. I urge the Congress to increase funds for grant aid to needy students, by making the Pell grant a genuine entitlement, with a maximum grant of $5,000.

Ladies and gentlemen, if we had simply added to the cost of inflation over the Pell grants since its inception, the Pell grant maximum today ought to be at least $4,000. As you know, it is only $2,300. That means that many of our finest young students and many of those who need financial support have not been able to realize the dollars they need to obtain a higher education.

I also urge you to expand graduate scholarships for women and minorities, especially in the scientific and technical fields. And apropos the conversation this morning with our two young panelists, I really hope that this Congress will attend seriously to the issue of simplifying the Federal student aid application process, by reducing the number of data elements, by allowing students to submit an application only one time, and thereafter simply support updated information.

And last but not least, with respect to educational opportunity, I urge this Congress to expand successful programs like Head Start and Upward Bound. I hope the Congress will increase support for applied social science research in areas vital to the formulation of critical national policies, and the resolution of the problems which plague this Nation.

And last but not least, I encourage the Congress to provide incentives for the formulation of genuine partnerships between higher education, American industry and Federal agencies, to stimulate research and development in the technical areas, which will be so very vital to our economy, to the quality of our life and our other national imperatives in the year 2000 and beyond.

Members of this committee, the task is monumental, the needs are genuine and the challenges are clear. As this Congress considers the Higher Education Reauthorization Act, I ask you to resurrect the partnership, the historic partnership which has existed between higher education and the Federal Government.

Let me conclude by urging that, as you consider these issues, even in light of the massive needs that this Nation faces today, that you remember the words of that unknown philosopher who once observed, "That the language of history is littered with the skeletons of good ideas which died for the absence of courage," and indeed, this Congress will have the vision and the courage and the leadership to be the Congress which has restored the historic partnership between higher education and the Nation.

Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, thank you for your time, for your opportunity and for holding this very important hearing.

I would be pleased now to respond to any questions you may have.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Albright follows:]

Prepared Statement of Robert L. Albright

Chairman Kennedy, other distinguished members of this Committee on Labor and Human Resources, fellow panelists, ladies and gentlemen: I am indeed pleased and deeply honored to have the privilege of testifying before you today. I am Robert L. Albright, President of Johnson C. Smith University (Charlotte, NC) and although I wear many organizational hats and represent several constituencies, I come before you today absent of any organizational agenda. Rather I appear, simply, as the president of a small, private, historically black college to discuss with you the needs and challenges of higher education as we enter the last decade of this century and approach the year 2000. In so doing, I fully recognize the impossible burden of speaking definitively for the 3,400 institutions of higher education which represent the academy in this Nation. However, I trust that the general nature of my comments will help to enlighten this august panel while not offending any of colleagues I am privileged to represent today.

In my testimony today, I should like to stress four points and in so doing I shall rely heavily on the report of the National Commission on Challenges in Higher Education entitled, A Memorandum to the 41st President of the United States. First, I should like to remind you of the widespread, important and unique contributions our system of higher education has made to the Nation. Second, I should like to share with you some sense of the problems which now plague the academy as we enter the last decade of this century. Third, I intend to describe, briefly, the challenges which this Nation will experience as we prepare for the imperatives of the 21st Century. Finally, I shall be pleased to suggest to you the manner in which higher education can help the Nation meet these challenges. I recognize, of course, that the time for my verbal testimony is limited; hence, I shall only briefly touch upon these matters and submit a full written statement for the record of this hearing.

American Higher Education: A Uniquely Democratic Institution

Permit me to begin by attempting to place into some perspective the state of American higher education today. In my capacity as president of Johnson C. Smith University, I have had the opportunity to travel abroad widely—and, on behalf of the Department of Education, the State Department and other organizations, the responsibility to conduct assessments of the higher educational systems of China, Israel, South Africa, and most recently Japan. And, the simple truth of the matter is that in spite of our own criticisms of our academy, it is still widely regarded as being the most democratic, well structured and successful higher education apparatus in existence today. It is a system which is widely admired and emulated for several distinct reasons, as follows:

—First, our system of higher education is the most diverse in the entire world. Represented in the American academy are private institutions, public colleges and universities, single sex colleges, institutions representing specific ethnic interests, colleges and universities with a distinct religious orientation, junior and community colleges and proprietary institutions. Indeed, many argue that the genuine strength and genius of our system of higher education is that we pro-

vide an opportunity for each student to find his or her own place among our panoply of institutions of higher education;

—Second, unlike other countries, where higher education is often reserved for the wealthy or the intellectually superior, we have extended the borders of higher education to almost all of our citizens—race, ethnic status or socioeconomic circumstances notwithstanding;

—Third, we have built a unique set of partnerships to fuel the higher educational apparatus in this Nation; a partnership which embraces the Federal Government, State governments, local communities, philanthropic interests, foundations, students and their families. This historic and unique partnership helped to develop and strengthen our colleges; built the strongest scientific enterprise in history; opened the doors of higher education to millions; developed the technological advances which have dramatically transformed the world in which we live; created the strongest economy in history; and significantly expanded the work force of the Nation.

—Fourth, in addition to extending the boundaries of knowledge, our colleges and universities have been widely engaged in the resolution of the social problems which affect our Nation. Indeed, it is a rather cherished credo in higher education that each of our institutions has the responsibility to educate, conduct research and engage in public service. Hence, our institutions of higher education are and continue to be important social institutions as well as educational institutions. They have been and are unique partners in the building and strengthening of America.

Higher Education: An Enterprise Under Siege

And yet, in spite of these achievements—and they genuinely are remarkable achievements—our system of higher education has not been without travail over the past few years. All around us, there are indices that the historic and unique partnerships which have made our institutions of higher education the envy of the world are dissipating and that our institutions are struggling to maintain their state of world-wide eminence. Hence, with your permission, I should like to cite just a few of the problems and challenges which threaten to erode the ability of higher education to continue to serve the Nation well as we prepare for the vicissitudes and complexities of the 21st century:

—The spiraling costs of higher education threaten many of the smaller colleges of our Nation which have provided not only opportunities for students who need and want the unique, rich and nurturing environment which such institutions provide for the students who need same—but which have also provided the leadership and workforce which drives our wheels of industry;

—Many of our institutions are aged and have significant deferred maintenance problems. As a consequence, they are not able to accommodate the increasing number of students who seek and want the opportunity to pursue higher education;

—After decades of leading the world in scientific advances, many of our institutions are simply unable to keep pace with the need for new scientific equipment which will allow them to maintain the "cutting edge of knowledge" for the students they serve. As you may know, scientific equipment is horribly expensive and the significant improvements in technology occasion equipment to become outdated in a relatively few years. Hence, it should come as no surprise to any of you that we are slowly losing our scientific and technological preeminence to the nations of the Pacific rim. The sad reality is that we are producing fewer scientists, mathematicians, and engineers today than we did 20 years ago!

—Federal budget cuts over the past decade seriously threaten to erode both our historic national commitment to equal access in higher education and the unique partnership between the Federal Government and higher education. In light of the coming phenomenon of "one-third of the Nation," we should be investing more resources—rather than less—in student aid resources as we make every earnest effort to educate the ever increasing number of minorities in our Nation—populations which my distinguished friend and colleague, Dr. Norman Francis, President of Xavier College in New Orleans, LA refers to as our last national resource. In my view, gentlemen, it is a national tragedy that in spite of the record number of minority students who graduate from our high schools each year, both the number and the percentage of minority students who enter and graduate from our colleges and universities are lower now than in 1976;

—The absence of resources, which has occasioned cuts among our faculties, now jeopardizes our ability to prepare our students (and indeed our Nation) for the

realities of existence, cooperation and understanding in a world community which grows increasingly smaller and interdependent. As an educator, I am deeply saddened that so many of our students and people are essentially devoid of an international perspective and that we, as Americans, are not as multi-lingual as are even many of the most socially and economically impoverished citizens of third world countries. Our inability to provide strong international and intercultural educational programs, in conjunction with foreign language training, may serve to further hasten our economic decline and our ability to formulate important new partnerships with the emerging democracies in Europe and the nations that today are in a state of economic ascendancy.

Obviously, any one of my colleagues could provide an even fuller litany of the problems and challenges which confront the academy today. However, for the purpose of this hearing, I trust that the above will help properly frame the problems and inform the important debate which this committee and the cognizant subcommittees of this Congress must consider. Therefore, let me now turn to a summary discussion of the challenges which I believe our Nation will face as we enter the 21st Century.

Toward the Year 2000: National Challenges

What, then, are the challenges we face as a nation as we prepare to enter the 21st Century? Although there are many, permit me to focus on those which higher education is uniquely prepared to address.

First, as a nation, we must find strategies and mechanisms to protect our national interests while concurrently promoting regional and international cooperation. Hence, to borrow from the the Commission on National Challenges' Memorandum to the 41st President of the United States, "as a nation we must educate Americans for an increasingly interdependent world." Events of the past year in Europe, the Pacific Rim, South Africa, and the Middle East must compel us to understand that the world grows smaller daily—and that no nation is immune to the vicissitudes which affect our allies, neighbors and even foes. Put simply, the world as we have known it is changing far more rapidly and dramatically than anyone could have imagined—and it is therefore imperative that we fully commit our resources and imaginations to prepare our students and future generations for a new world order.

Second, America must gear up significantly to revitalize our economy. Mounting budget and trade deficits, shrinking economic growth rates and the loss of Important markets to foreign competitors are all clear signals that our economy suffers from serious structural weaknesses. Moreover, as our most prominent "futurists" have warned us, America—and indeed the world—is rapidly changing from an industrial and agricultural economy to a complex and highly demanding technological society. Hence, we must revitalize our institutions of higher education so that they can once again serve as the major sources of discovery, innovation, and invention to contribute more productively to the renewal of our new advanced, technologically based economy. To accomplish this goal, higher education must work more effectively to translate discoveries into useful products by creating new relationships with industry that will supplement basic academic research.

Further, we must strengthen elementary and secondary education by upgrading teacher training, attracting more of our best and brightest students to careers in math and science, and more effectively addressing the national phenomenon of adult illiteracy. In brief, we must seize the time and initiative to effect the strategies, programs, and national commitment to prepare a national workforce better equipped to compete in the technologically demanding and complex labor market of the 21st Century. Our survival as a nation will depend upon our success.

Third, and equally important for the task of revitalizing our economy and preserving the values upon which this Nation has been built, we must find new ways of expanding educational opportunities for those who have been denied full access. It is, in my view, a national tragedy that the unemployment rate among minority teenagers (especially among Black Americans) hovers around 50 percent—and that there are almost as many minority youth in our prisons as are enrolled in higher education. And, these ominous trends come, in the words of the National Commission, "at a time when the job requirements of a technological society are demanding much higher levels of preparation." Indeed, according to a recent study of the Department of Labor, between now and the year 2000, a majority of all new jobs will—for the first time in history—call for some form of postsecondary education.

Members of this distinguished committee: the sad reality is that over the last decade, we have witnessed the reemergence of barriers that threaten not only the progress we have made in equalizing opportunity but, in addition, the very well

being of our Nation. In effect, rising tuitions, growing student debt burdens, declining minority participation in higher education and increased dropout rates all signal a decline in access to higher education— and the emergence of both chronic unemployment and a vast and growing underclass. For far too many of the poor, illiterate and disadvantaged, the "American Dream" has become the American nightmare. And, as the eternal flame of hope dims for those who are the least advantaged in our society, illegal drugs have become the new opiate of the people; a life of crime has become the new survival mechanism; our inner cities have become war zones; and our young have completely lost faith with a society which seems to have abandoned them.

Clearly, gentlemen, this Nation must act—and act now—to reduce unemployment among minorities and youth, as well as to lift the veil of poverty from the millions of our children who live in our ghettos, our barrios and on our reservations: the children who must grow into the men and women prepared and capable of being not only our workforce, but our leaders of the future. And so, I ask you: can this nation survive as a divided house? Can we afford not to harvest and prepare our last national resource? And, at our own peril, dare we risk ignoring those who cry out daily for our assistance; for opportunity; and for the kind of partnership which will allow them to become contributing members of our society rather than a permanent underclass in our society? I think not! Obviously, we must remember that a sound education for all of our people is our strongest national defense and the salvation of the qualities and values we seek as a people.

Fourth, the high national standard of living we have enjoyed (relative to other nations) is in a state of decline. Today, our people face growing problems of environmental deterioration, a crumbling urban infrastructure. the uncertainty of energy supplies to fuel our national economy and well being, inadequate health care delivery, widespread poverty, hunger, the scourge of illegal subetances and even rising rates of illiteracy. Hence, in many ways, we are a nation at risk of internal decay—a specter that is all the more tragic because we have failed to make the requisite commitment to mobilize our massive resources, technology and will to resolve these problems. And yet, if we are to maintain a strong economy, continue to play a leadership role on the world stage, make full use of our human capital (our most precious commodity) and achieve the high standard of living which is a part of the promise of America for all of her citizens, we must effect new public policies to ameliorate the problems which threaten to engulf and overwhelm our Nation.

Well, having shared with you some of the problems I believe that America must address as we experience the last decade of this century, permit me to now describe the role that higher education can and must play as an active and contributing partner to help meet our national challenges of the future.

Higher Education: A Future Look

Fundamental to a resolution of the problems which affect higher education and the Nation, in my view, is a restoration and strengthening of the historic partnership between higher education and the Federal Government—a partnership which from World War II until recently, expanded the borders of knowledge, research and development; made real the promise of equal access in higher education; provided new perspectives about other countries and cultures; contributed to our quality of life through dramatic discoveries in such fields as food production, environmental protection, space exploration, communications, the eradication of disease and prolonging life; and building a strong economy. Obviously, we are cognizant of the important role we have played and we are painfully aware of the responsibilities we must bear to help this Nation recapture its previous position of eminence in every field of the human endeavor.

Accordingly, as we prepare for the year 2000, we are fully committed to assuming the following tasks:

1. To help educate Americans for an increasingly interdependent world, we are prepared to:
—strengthen all fields of international study, encourage the teaching and study of foreign languages and cultures;
—provide more opportunities for exchange of students and teachers between America and other countries;
—insure that our professional schools, particularly those concerned with law, public policy and business and international studies, devote more time and attention to international issues.
2. To expand educational opportunity, we are committed to:

—intensifying our efforts to reach and counsel disadvantaged students about higher education earlier in their secondary school careers;
—developing new partnerships and special programs with elementary and secondary schools targeted toward the enhancement of educational opportunities for minorities;
—intensifying our efforts to recruit, enroll and retain more minority students;
—providing more scholarship support to minority students;
—restructuring our teacher education programs to heighten the sensitivity and preparation of potential teachers to address more effectively the needs of minority students;
—and increasing the flow of minority students into the graduate and professional school pipeline.

3. To help revitalize the economy, we are prepared to:
—intensify our efforts to seek private funds to upgrade and replace outmoded facilities for research and technology;
—Improve management training in business schools by emphasizing production, engineering and design, while placing greater emphasis on the special problems and opportunities of doing business abroad;
—strengthen our courses and programs of study in industrial engineering and provide stronger mid-career programs for training engineers;
—strengthen elementary and secondary education by upgrading teacher training, attracting more math and science teachers, and fostering local partnerships with elementary and secondary schools;
—develop partnerships with cities, Chambers of Commerce and other local partners to address the problem of adult illiteracy.

4. To help meet essential human needs and improve the quality of we are prepared to:
—strengthen our programs of art, culture and humanities;
—commit resources to research and development programs necessary to eradicate the problems of urban decay, energy supply needs, improved health care delivery and the decay of our environment;
—seek a new relationship with private industry, local, State and national governments to develop enhanced and enlightened public policies and social science research directed toward ameliorating the problems of unemployment, housing, adult illiteracy and poverty.

Our understanding of the problems which affect America and our enterprise is acute—and our commitment is genuine. However, if we are to accomplish the rather epic agenda we have set for ourselves, we must achieve the renaissance of the historic partnership between the academy and government. We recognize, as have many of our greatest political leaders, that "America's progress will falter unless our people are sustained by the spirit of critical inquiry and a fully engaged community of learning." Therefore, your leadership and the vision, commitment and courage of this Congress is essential for restoring the partnership we seek and must have.

Conclusion

Permit me to conclude, as I am confident you knew I would, by suggesting to you some of the needs of higher education as we seek to assist the Nation resolve our problems and prepare America for a restoration of our role of world leadership in the 21st Century. I promise I will be brief.

First, with regard to the area of international and intercultural education, we recommend that the Congress:
—Support strengthening of international studies and research, including area studies centers and teaching at all levels about foreign countries and cultures;
—Expand the teaching and study of foreign languages in our schools, colleges and universities;
—Assist colleges and universities in the United States in developing joint educational and research programs with institutions in other countries.

Second, with respect to support to education and research to help revitalize the economy, we urge the Congress to:
—Initiate programs to add to the supply of teachers at all levels of the educational system and to improve their training (especially in the scientific, quantitative and technological subjects where the shortage of qualified teachers is most acute);
—Reinforce existing national programs for short-term employment training by providing tuition assistance for dislocated and displaced workers;

—Make permanent the provisions of the tax code that exempt from taxation the educational benefits that members of the work force receive from their employers;
—Expand Federal support for undergraduate research, graduate student assistantships and faculty research;
—Support the construction and renovation of research and teaching facilities through matching grants and low interest loans by the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health and other agencies whose missions include research support (we also urge that matching provisions should be waived for institutions with a limited financial base that demonstrate a clear commitment to upgrading their science programs);
—Implement existing legislative authority to help colleges and universities obtain access to capital markets for construction renovation and equipment of facilities;
—Encourage the development of new partnerships between business and education to stimulate the industrial and commercial applications of academic research.

Third, to reafirm the national commitment to expanded educational access and opportunity, we urge the Congress to:

—Expand successful programs like Head Start and Upward Bound to intensify Federal efforts to encourage disadvantaged students to complete school and to pursue a college education;
—Increase funds for grant assistance to needy students by making the Pell Grant a genuine entitlement;
-Simplify the Federal student aid application process by providing a revised simplified federal form (with a minimum number of data elements) for families with incomes below $16,000; and effect a new process which would permit students at the sophomore, junior or senior year level (who previously applied for student aid as freshmen) to supply updated information only (including the most recent student or parental tax return) instead of a whole new application;
—Continue action to reduce student loan defaults and particularly the heavy loan burdens now being visited upon the poorest and most educationally disadvantaged students;
—Expand graduate fellowships for minorities and women, especially in the physical sciences and engineering (such fellowships should include summer research grants assistantships, advanced research and training opportunities and early identification of potential recipients);
—Coordinate Federal, State and local welfare policies so that welfare recipients who receive student aid do not risk losing their maintenance benefits.

Fourth, to assist higher education more successfulIy address the human needs in our society and to improve the quality of life for all Americans, we request that Congress:

—Increase support for applied social science research in areas vital to the formulation of national policies by such agencies as the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Labor, the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Education;
—Initiate programs to study and improve the quality of public and preventive health care and the delivery of health care services;
—Strengthen the capacity of the Federal Government to collect and disseminate statistical data about the demography of the work force, patterns of health and education, and other social and economic indicators;
—Reaffirm the importance of the liberal arts tradition in our society by providing Federal support for the arts and humanities, libraries and museums;
—Increase Federal support for the preservation and maintenance of books and other scholarly resources and for the development of new computerized capabilities for information storage and retrieval through the Library of congress and other agencies.

Again, to cite directly from the work of the Commission on Challenges in Higher Education, "although the agenda we have set before you is ambitious . . . in offering this agenda, we ask no more of you than we ask of ourselves." We seek, not a Federal handout or dole—but rather a strong and viable partnership. We are convinced that only in this manner can the nation, and higher education, successfully address the immense challenges and imperatives of the 21st Century, for the task is monumental; the needs are genuine; and the challenges are clear. Hence, as this important committee, and the Congress in general, consider the programs and resources necessary to resurrect our historic partnership and to revitalize the Nation, we hope that you will be mindful of the wonderfully apocryphal words of the un-

known philosopher who once observed that "the landscape of history is littered with the skeletons of fine ideas which died for the absence of courage."

Gentlemen, as this committee considers, debates and provides insight and leadership for this Congress, vis-a-vis the needs and challenges of higher education and the Nation for the 21st Century, I urge you not to be paralyzed by the Scylla of difficult choices and the Charybdis of opportunity. Hence, with respect to the vision and commitment that you must have, I close by reminding you of the eternal optimism of a great American statesman and leader, the late President John F. Kennedy, who once gave us this powerfully inspirational phrase:

The cause endures, the struggle continues, and the dream shall never die

Mr. Chairman and the members of this important committee, again I thank you for the opportunity to testify before you today. I trust that my words and comments will help you to frame and inform the important debate that this Congress will face as it wrestles with strategies and legislation to engage higher education in the solution of the problems and needs of our Nation. I shall be pleased to now answer any questions you may have about my testimony or any other matters of particular interest to you.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Dr. Albright, I was going to get into a question about what needs to be done to address some of those issues or problems that you have identified. I think you have given us a pretty good list.

I will tell you one of the most distressing recent reminders that I have had is I had 800 applications for the military academies. I send down and the academy has to pick one. A third is appointed by the Senate, a third by the House, and the third by the President. So, I send 10 down and they have to pick one, and then they pick one from each of the members of the House and Senate, and then they go and the President looks over generally the pool and, as a result, I have more people in all of the academies than any other member of the House and Senate, more kids from our State.

I have 800 applications and did not have one black from Massachusetts. I sifted down the 250 semi-finalists, and not one black, the first time in 28 years. Certainly, there is a lot more the military academies ought to do and the rest of it is just—you talk about, you know, virtually a free education obligation, in terms of the country, but just all of the flow lines that you have identified, I was looking through a couple of weeks ago, in terms of trying to review what those 10 candidates are going to be like, and I was just struck by this and it was enormously distressing.

I just have one question, and I will ask if these answers can be brief. Dr. Finn, you have outlined whether—quite frankly, I find there are very few of these that I would really take much issue with. I have had three children who have gone through higher education fairly recently and I have followed their careers and interests, talking with them and their friends. But how do you implement these in higher education? Do you have suggestions of how those could be implemented, if we make a decision that we agree?

Mr. FINN. I cannot go down and match up each of my 10 criticisms with a program, and it would depend upon which of the problems we are most setting out to solve, but there is couple of directions that I would encourage. One is getting a lot better information about what students are learning, the assessment enterprise of higher education. We have been fussing all morning about an applied elementary-secondary. There is almost nothing in higher education.

Second, there is almost no merit or achievement factor built into any of the Federal student aid programs today. Good students or students who do well or students who work hard in school are students who are well-prepared for college or students who do well in college once they get there are rewarded not at all by the Federal apparatus.

Indeed, for 20 years there has been something of a fear of rewarding achievement or attainment or merit or quality or performance in the student aid apparatus, and I think there are half a dozen opportunities, programmatic opportunities under that heading to at least explore.

I think also there could be incentives and rewards for completion of college, not just for entrance into it. I think there could be incentives and rewards for institutions that are efficient, as opposed to inefficient in the use of resources. And you have got a handful of little programs, like FPSI, which could be helped to work on things like curriculum, that weak-kneed, lily-livered poor curriculum that I was talking about earlier, that is just for starters.

The CHAIRMAN. We have passed last year legislation to give consumers information, both in the graduation rates, particularly as related to scholarships and athletes, and also in crime, and we faced resistance from the institutions on this, as the nose under the tent, in terms of the Federal participation in this. There is such a demand by parents, in terms of problems of crime on campus and off campus, as well as graduation rates, there is such a compelling sense on, we would be successful.

Senator Simon.

Senator SIMON. Thank you both very much.

Dr. Finn, your statement that the summit meeting just virtually ignored higher education I think is a very important point.

I would also be interested in any specifics you might be able to send us, as we reauthorize the Higher Education Act, how we encourage the student who really works hard and moves ahead.

Dr. Albright, first of all, your suggestion that we have an entitlement of the Pell grant, I would love to see us do it for all 4 years right away. I do not think that is realistically going to be in the offing. I would love to go to the $5,000 figure you are talking about. I think that also probably is going to have to be lowered a little bit, but I hope we can come not far from where you are talking about.

Second, I have been impressed by you, and this is at least the second time I have heard you testifying before a committee, and I have been most impressed both times. I would be interested in any suggestions you have as to how we encourage that international dimension in higher education, as we reauthorize the Act.

We have fewer than one-half of 1 percent of our students now who are studying abroad at any point during their college careers, far lower than it used to be. Faculty studying abroad, teaching abroad, is also way down. That cannot be good for this country. So, I would be interested in any specifics.

Back when I was in the House, I had a proposal for $15 per full-time equivalent student that would be a grant to each college. I do not know what the answer is, but I would be interested in your creative look at that.

Finally, how do we encourage the smaller colleges, not simply the traditional black colleges, but all smaller colleges? I am on the board of trustees of a small college in Nebraska, Dana College. I spent 2 years there. I am concerned about the lack of endowment.

Your school, Johnson C. Smith, has how many students and how much endowment?

Mr. ALBRIGHT. 1,200 students, Senator, and our endowment has recently grown to about $10 million which we control, and $12 million which is held in trust for us with 3 other institutions.

Senator SIMON. That is not good, but it is a heck of a lot better than it is for a lot of other schools——

Mr. ALBRIGHT. Exactly.

Senator SIMON. [continuing]. Including a lot of other historically black colleges. But what we do in this bill to encourage these smaller schools, some of them just sitting on the edge of survival——

Mr. ALBRIGHT. Absolutely.

Senator SIMON. [continuing]. And then they are tempted to do the very thing that Dr. Finn talked about, to survive, you know, you compromise standards when you should not compromise standards.

Mr. ALBRIGHT. Senator, in the interest of time, because I realize you have a debate on the Gulf issue, I will submit in writing to you—I do want to say to you how delighted I am to know of your continued interest in the whole area of international education, because when I returned from Japan, I must frankly say to you, I was alarmed. I have had several conversations with my colleagues in elementary and secondary schools, because, frankly, the Japanese will admit to us that our system of higher education is far superior to their system of higher education, but the disparity is between the elementary and secondary education.

I believe the one point I would agree with Dr. Finn is that the university examination in Japan, in my view, drives the entire educational process, and somehow we have to encourage our own better relationships between elementary and secondary, but also to help all of our people understand how important it is for us to develop a world dimension. So, I will submit to you in writing thoughts with respect to that matter, as well as thoughts with regard to how we can strengthen our small private colleges which have provided so much to this Nation, without really jeopardizing the qualitative aspects of the education offered by same.

Senator SIMON. I thank you both.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Bingaman.

Senator BINGAMAN. Mr. Chairman, in light of the time, I will put off my questions and try to contact each of the witnesses individually. I do appreciate their testimony. It has been excellent.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

The committee stands in recess.

[Whereupon, at 12:49 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

○

41-189 (104)